THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 5, 6 & 7. AUGUST, SEPT. OCT., 1938. VOL. XXVIII.

THE LOUGHBOROUGH CONFERENCE

MODERN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

By the EDITOR.

The twenty-fifth Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen held at Loughborough College, Leicestershire, September 5th to 10th, took as its theme 'Modern Christian Education.' The following fourteen papers, published in full in this issue of the *Modern Churchman*, were read before the Conference and discussed by it :—

The Christian Teacher and the Modern World, by Sir Cyril Norwood, President of St. John's College, Oxford.

The Religious Ideal of Education, by J. T. Christie, Esq., M.A., Headmaster of Westminster School.

Modern Christian Education and Democracy, by Miss A. M. Ashley, M.A., Headmistress of Honor Oak School.

The Place of Psychology in Religious Education, by Basil Yeaxlee, M.A., B.Litt., Ph.D., Department of Education, Oxford.

The Church and the Child, by the Rev. Chancellor Mulliner, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Truro.

Public School Religious Education, by the Rev. N. V. Gorton, M.A., Headmaster of Blundell's School.

The English Universities and Modern Christian Education, by the Rev. Canon Norman Sykes, M.A., D.Phil., Professor of History, University of London.

The Teaching of the Old Testament, by the Rev. P. Gardner-Smith, B.D., Fellow and Dean of Jesus College, Cambridge.

The Educational Use of the New Testament, by Professor C. J. Cadoux, M.A., B.D., Mansfield College, Oxford.

The Educational Value of Public Divine Worship, by the Rev. Canon R. D. Richardson, M.A., B.Litt.

Co-ordination in Art, Literature and History with Modern Christian Education, by T. F. Coade, Esq., M.A., Headmaster of Bryanston School.

Co-ordination of Science with Modern Christian Education, by the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc.

Ecclesia Docens et Discens, by the Rev. A. C. Bouquet, D.D.

Authority and Freedom in Modern Christian Education, by the Rev. J. S. Boys Smith, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Cambridge.

In a world, which, we are so often told, is rapidly becoming pagan and in which civilization has broken down, modern Christian education is beset with difficulty. Nevertheless, the tone and temper of the Loughborough Conference was sanely optimistic. It was felt by its members that there was no real justification for the view that civilization has broken down, but rather that in its very rapid development modern civilization has become lop-sided: its scientific, mechanistic and materialistic sides having developed much more rapidly than its moral and spiritual sides. Although it was frankly recognized that our modern civilization has passed through one terrible crisis and is facing another, yet, this is no clear indication that the Christian religion is less influential for good in the present than it has been in the past. Organized Christianity has undoubtedly declined in a most remarkable manner during the twentieth century and there were few at the Conference who would not have agreed that it deserved its fate. On the other hand, there appeared to be indications that the Christianity that had collapsed was making way for a better and more influential type of Christianity, which would, within the next generation, not only recover the ground that had been lost but greatly extend the influence of the Christian religion, not perhaps in the sphere of organization,

but by the incorporation of the foundation principles of that religion — freedom, truth, love — into the structure of our modern civilization on a world-wide scale.

In many gatherings of Churchmen there would probably have been discussions as to the nature of Christianity; but at the Loughborough Conference, there seemed to be a general agreement that it is its principles, ideals, spirit, which constitute the essential element in the Christian religion, and as to what those principles are, there seemed to be no doubt whatever. It was recognized of course that there are many historical and literary problems yet to be solved in connection with the Christian religion, but these, it was felt, were all secondary, and that the largest possible measure of freedom should be granted by Church authority, both for research and utterance, in these spheres. The real problems of the Church to-day, and so of the modern Christian educationist, are how to promote the recognition and acceptance of Christian principles by mankind, and how to apply those principles, loyally and effectively, in all departments of modern life. It is here that the main work of the modern Christian educationist is to be found.

Where perhaps less agreement existed was as to what amount of reliance can be placed upon the Christian Church as a modern Christian educationist. Cannot we dispense with the clergyman and rely on the Christian schoolmaster to make the English nation Christian?

Education has very largely passed out of the hands of the clergy into those of the laity. The Christian Church in England has in the past done a great work as a Christian educationist but surely her work is now nearly over: not because it has been completed, for there is a vast amount yet to be done, but because she has lost her influence as a Christian educationist. Church congregations are said to have declined by three-fourths since the War: church schools and Sunday schools show an alarming decrease. Why is this?

Many reasons are given. The succession of fights in the spheres of science, history, sociology, and education, in which the ecclesiastics have fought on the wrong side and been worsted, has had its effect on the public mind. The ghosts of *Essays and*

Reviews, Biblical Infallibility, the Deceased Wife's Sister, and other fights, have come home to roost. The Church belfry is full of bats. Some of them, natives of the Protestant underworld: some of them, migrants from continental Romanism: and as a consequence, many simple English folk prefer the sunshine and the green fields or the crowded road and the little car to Church attendance.

Nevertheless, it was felt at Loughborough, that the Christian religion would have very little chance of survival without the Christian Church. If the Christian Church has been the deadliest enemy to the Christian religion it has also been its most devoted champion. In England, the Church of England is potentially the greatest Christian educationist. The historic position of the Church in city cathedrals and in country villages: in the ancient universities and in the public schools: in the army and in the navy: in the hospital and in the orphanage: in short, in all national institutions, provides her with immeasurable opportunities of Christian influence. Wherever the right kind of personality represents the Church: whether it be a Prebendary Carlile or a Canon Streeter, a Dick Sheppard or a Studdert Kennedy, the power of the Church in this land, as a Christian educationist, becomes immediately manifest. It is perfectly clear that in this country we cannot do without the Church as a Christian educationist. But the real problem for Churchmen to-day is how to make the Church a much more effective Christian educationist than she is.

The Headmaster of Blundell's School dealt with the lack of continuity between the Public School and the Church as Christian educationists. Why is it so many, when in a Public School, are interested in the Christian religion, attend its public worship with gratification and feel that its teaching meets their spiritual, moral, and intellectual needs, yet, when they go out into the world, experience no such satisfaction in their Parish Church and hardly ever attend its services?

Mr. Gorton affirmed that this was due to the boys not having been instructed in the nature and functions of the Church: the need of loyal devotion to her: and the lack of training in corporate sacramental worship. What we need, Mr. Gorton maintained,

is a new liturgical movement; and as a preliminary to that, a right, central theology embodied in the Church's liturgy.

Of course to-day we do need liturgical reform which would purge and simplify our sacramental services and so complete the liturgical reformation inaugurated with such courage and carried forward with such wisdom and fine feeling by Cranmer four hundred years ago. But the question has to be faced as to whether sacramental Christian Worship is able to make, not only a universal, but, a constant appeal to the Christian Englishman as that form of Public Worship which helps him most. Whatever may have appealed to Christians in past ages, many of them the heirs of Jewish and Pagan rites which stressed the dramatic, symbolic, and materialistic elements in Divine Worship, we doubt whether there is one in ten to-day of Christian Englishmen who values sacramental worship as a normal means of approach to God. The ordinary Englishman is prepared under a constraining sense of Christian duty to take part in such sacramental worship at the great festivals of the Church, and when his children are baptized and confirmed. To make eucharistic worship the normal Sunday morning worship in our Parish churches must mean the non-attendance of some nine-tenths of the parishioners. In view of this, the early Eucharist provides all that the ardent sacramentalist has any right to claim, when this early Eucharist, on Sundays, Saints' Days and perhaps daily, is supplemented by a monthly mid-day corporate Eucharist in his Parish Church.

The attempt to accomplish more sacramentally leads either to one of two things: the gradual reduction of Church membership to practising sacramentalists or the encouragement of the practice of non-communicating attendance at the Eucharist. We believe both to be detrimental to the influence of the Church as a Christian educationist. It was one of the triumphs of the English Reformation that the mediaeval Mass gave place to the Holy Communion where the congregation became communicants instead of being merely auditors.

The two most influential factors in securing crowded congregations at celebrations in the Roman Church are (1) compulsion, (2) belief in the miracle of the Mass. The English Church can-

not use compulsion to-day nor can it teach Transubstantiation with any hope that it will be credited by one in twenty of the population. If by a new liturgical movement were to be understood a judicious reformation and a many-sided expansion of different types of Divine Worship (including of course the sacramental) we, as Modernists, are, as Canon Richardson's Conference paper indicates, entirely in favour of it. But, if a new liturgical movement is to be limited to a reformed communion service which is to be made the sole, central and corporate, service in our Parish Churches at 11 o'clock on Sunday morning, we deprecate it. To-day most church people are 'oncers,' and we ought not to drive from our public worship many of those solid Church loyalists who find much help in a 'good church service' consisting of a somewhat shortened Morning Prayer, numerous popular hymns, and a short simple stirring sermon. This is what public school boys have become accustomed to in their school chapel and they miss it in an increasing number of their Parish Churches to-day. That is one reason at least why there is a lack of continuity between the religious education of the Public School and of the Parish Church.

We know that this is not acceptable doctrine to many of our fellow-clergy, who driven to desperation by the sight of their dwindling congregations, have 'put on a Sunday morning sung Eucharist.' After all, says Mr. Gorton : 'we are priests working an ecclesiastical system.' The more we obtrude that view on the English laity the less support and sympathy we shall get from them. They hate the notion of the Church as a system with so much fuss about organization and finance and so little fellowship and friendliness. They repudiate the thought of their clergy as priests offering sacrifices. They have no belief at all in ritual sacrifices. They do not regard ritual sacrifice as commanded by the Christian Religion.

After listening to Mr. Gorton's paper, another Headmaster, with some 700 boys under him said : Jesus was against sacrifice. Did He not cite with approbation Hosea's declaration that God did not require sacrifice from Israel? 'I will have loving-kindness : I will not have sacrifice.'[1]

[1] *Hosea* vi, 6 ; cited twice, *Mt.* ix, 13 ; xii, 7.

Perhaps a tenth of our fellow-countrymen are able to be made into Catholic Churchmen. But all our efforts at 'catholicising' do not seem capable of achieving more than this. Are the remaining nine-tenths to be made to feel that because they cannot become 'catholic sacramentalists' they have neither part nor lot in the Church of England? That is a crucial question for our Church authorities. Modernists are convinced that we need to make the Church wide enough in its sympathies to welcome on an equal footing sacramental and non-sacramental members, and to provide, at least with equal zeal, types of public worship suitable for all; and in this worship modern Christian education must play an important and increasing part.

The *Times* during the Loughborough Conference week (Sep. 6) published the following declaration of religious faith, entitled a 'Manifesto of Witness,' signed by 178 members of Parliament.

> In these momentous days when conflict and anxiety prevail on every side, we wish to bear our witness, for the encouragement of our fellow-men, to certain firm convictions gained from, and upheld by, the experience of life.
>
> *We believe in the Fatherhood of God. We believe that to those who seek it, God gives guidance and help.*
>
> *We believe in the brotherhood of man.*
>
> *We believe that the hope of the world is in the freedom brought about by that brotherhood, and the practice, in the Spirit of Christ, of truth and justice which it entails.*
>
> *We beleive that the human spirit desires to reach to a higher plane of conduct, and although prone to evil seeks through repentance and forgiveness to attain to harmony with the Divine Will.*
>
> *We believe that with the attainment of that harmony the understanding and wisdom and courage to settle the differences of mankind and bring peace will come.*
>
> In this faith we would seek to live, remembering always that throughout the world there are multitudes holding, in varied forms, the same faith and moving towards the same goal.

Why is it not possible for our Church leaders to make this declaration the practical basis of Church membership in the

Church of England? Such a faith, all must allow, is essentially Christian. Those who hold it are not precluded thereby from believing, in addition, all the statements made in our Church formularies. Why should not such a creed be made not only the basis for comprehensive Christian reunion in this land, but also the basis of a national system of religious education in our schools? And why should not inspiring Church services be provided which express the conviction and aspirations of such a faith without seeking to introduce into them controversial details which would disfigure its majestic proportions?

Of course, in addition, the Church would continue to provide sacramental services, both simple and elaborate, for those of its members who could helpfully use them. In a time of crisis like the present, will not some of our bishops take the lead in this matter? Although the Church has missed many opportunities since the Great War, yet the dayspring of a better age is dawning and the courageous initiative which she has exhibited during the last two years gives ground for hope.

It seemed clear from the Conference discussions that just as we could not dispense with the Church as one of the great factors in modern Christian education, so we could not dispense with the Scriptures, the Christian Sunday, and the Christian home. Yet each provides its own set of problems.

The over-valuation of the Bible has been followed naturally by its devaluation. It may be possible to have Christian education without the Bible, but Christian education is enormously enriched by the right use of the Bible. Frederick Temple, who contributed to *Essays and Reviews* (1860) the opening paper on 'The Education of the World,' deals with the right use of the Bible in education. In his day, when belief in the Plenary Verbal Inspiration of the Bible was an article of the Faith for all orthodox Christians, he warns his readers against the 'despotism of the Bible' and maintains that the right use of the Bible is to awaken and enlighten the human conscience, not to over-ride it. That must be the use of the Bible in modern religious education. For this purpose it is not the Bible as a whole but only selected portions of it that can be used. Hence, one of our modern needs, for purposes of Christian

education, is a varied supply of volumes of selected portions of Scripture with competent introductions and expositions. Such are being provided in increasing numbers. There is Dr. Inge's *Every Man's Bible, an Anthology* (3/6, 7/6, 10/6). There are also available *The Cambridge Shorter Bible*, by A. Nairne, T. R. Glover, and Sir A. Quiller-Couch (3/6), and *A Short Bible*, by V. J. K. Brook, A. A. David, W. H. Fyfe and A. E. Lynam (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 2/6). *The Heart of the Bible*, by J. B. T. Davies,[2] is perhaps the best of these manuals. The latest achievement, *The Bible designed to be read as Literature*, has had a wide circulation, but is intended not for beginners but for readers of mature mind.

The growing influence of modern science, and not least in the sphere of educational technique, places too much value on direct and too little value on indirect methods of education. In teaching religion, ethics, art, and all which contributes to the higher cultural values in human life, it is the indirect method which is supremely and permanently influential. In this sphere 'atmosphere' is overwhelmingly important: the personality of the teacher,

> 'Be what you wish others to become' (Amiel),

the insight and aspirations which he awakens in his pupil who must learn, not merely to discern, but to admire and to love.

> 'We live by admiration, hope and love.'
> 'Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control—
> These three alone lead life to sovereign power.'

If the teacher of religion and ethics is standing in many-sided fashion for one set of cultural influences and the pupil's parents and social environment are standing for quite another set, the soul of the pupil is like the driver of the chariot in Plato's metaphor with the white horse pulling him up and the black horse pulling him down. That is why modern educationists, striving to elicit the higher values, realize intensely that unless they can educate the parents of their pupils, they must largely fail in the education of the pupils themselves. It is here that the right educational use of Sunday comes in.

[2] Three vols., 5/- each; Allen and Unwin, 1933.

There appears to be increasing leisure in our modern civilization with a decreasing ability to use it rightly. 'The soul is dyed the colour of its leisure thoughts,' and the higher life of the individual is more influenced by the use he makes of his leisure than by the nature of his work.

Unless it be recognized by a human being that he has a higher nature and that that nature ought to be developed, and that a set portion of his time ought to be devoted to this development, all attempts to educate him when he has received his freedom must prove futile. There is no royal road to learning and there is no royal road to religious education. We may have religious education without tears, the wireless and popular press are doing their best to provide it, but we cannot have it if, in the spirit of self-discipline, we do not regularly devote a certain proportion of our time and attention to it. The Modernist Christian is as clear on this point as was the mediaeval monk.

There are two things which the Modernist must stress in Christian education; both were stressed in two notable utterances of Frederick Temple.

(1) Freedom in research and freedom in teaching.

> 'Where the conclusions are prescribed the study is precluded.'

(2) It is not dogmatic propositions nor historical facts but moral and spiritual values which the Christian educationist is mainly concerned to impart — values personally appropriated and progressively realized in the conduct and character of the pupil.

> 'Our theology has been cast in a scholastic mode, *i.e.* all based on logic. We are in need of, and we are being gradually forced into, a theology based on psychology. The transition, I fear, will not be without much pain: but nothing can prevent it.'

THE CHRISTIAN TEACHER AND THE MODERN WORLD

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

By Sir Cyril Norwood, D.Lit., President of St. John's College, Oxford, and President of the Modern Churchmen's Union.

A LONG time has elapsed since I addressed, or even attended, this Conference, but my failure to attend has not been due to estrangement or indifference, but to the preciousness to a schoolmaster of those halcyon days of September which precede the winter term. Year by year you have published the report of your proceedings, which I, like many others, have found valuable in adding to my knowledge and in clearing the processes of my thoughts: it is with an added sense of responsibility, and not without some sense of self-distrust, that I now address you, after you have done me the great honour of electing me to be your President.

My subject is the Christian Teacher and the Modern World, and indeed in its various aspects it is the subject of our whole Conference. It is right that it should be so, for I am one of those who believe that only by Christian education can the modern world be saved from an abyss of which no man can see the bottom: the descent thereto is steep and close at hand. The danger is created by our increasing command of enormous material forces, and the coincident decline in our material standards. We are, as it were, driving a vehicle of high power, the brakes of which are not working well and the steering-wheel is defective. There can therefore be no subject of graver importance than that which will engage our attention this week.

It is clearly necessary to define our terms, and particularly that term which looks so simple yet contains so many ambiguities and diversities of interpretation—the Christian Teacher. For there are so many Christians in the world: there are, as it were, so many overlayings, due to the lapse of time and the many growths and changes which it brings, that it is hard to see the original figure of the Founder beneath them, or to catch the authentic utterance of His message. Men and women turn away

indifferently from so many of the conventional presentations of Christianity which are offered to them, for these seem to be irrelevant to the needs of the modern world and at times wilfully obscurantist. It is true over a far wider field than was the case in Matthew Arnold's day that humanity is wandering between two worlds, one dead, the other powerless to be born. How much does the ordinary man or woman believe to-day? I remember reading that when a friend asked Tennyson what he believed, he answered in some such words as these: 'I believe in God and I believe that my personality endures: that is my faith and that is all my faith.' I am not sure that the ordinary man to-day would get further than an affirmation of the first of these propositions: about the possibilities of a future life he would be very undecided. He no longer fears Hell and he has ceased seriously to hope for Heaven: the one has become a region of comic stories and the other of fairy tales. But let us build on that affirmation, that God exists, God is, and ask what Christianity has to teach us about the nature of God. First, that God is good, and wishes us to be good, a quality which we cannot attain save by strife with, and conquest of, evil. Second, that God is truth, and is revealed in all true knowledge, so that no advance in knowledge can conflict with His will or our good if we have wisdom. And moreover He has endowed us with the power of reason, by using which in the spirit of truth we can unlock many mysteries and trace out the laws of created nature. Third, that God is in all beauty, and revealed by all beauty, beauty which stands out against ugliness, as good stands out against evil, but which is all about us for those who have eyes to see. Fourth, and here we reach what is essentially and specifically Christian, God is Love. This is the message which Christ mediated to the world, for 'God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself.' Let me bring back to your memories words used to you last year by the Bishop of Birmingham, when he spoke of his conviction that

> 'God's universe is shot through and through with goodness that shall in the end triumph. In Christ we see goodness triumphing over pain and evil. By this triumph we are led on to the certainty that His example and His gospel, if men would only accept them, would bring the world to God: and therein for me is the Incarnation.'

I share that conviction and repeat that creed, believing that in

this simple faith we can conquer: it is those who spread this faith and seek to live by it, wherever they are and whoever they are, that I call Christian teachers.

Turning to the modern world in relation to which we have to consider the possibility and the probable fruitfulness of Christian teaching in the sense described, I feel that you will not expect me to pass it under a thorough examination, lest there be no opportunity for any other speeches this week. But there are a number of observations about this modern world that can be made, and I shall try to avoid what I think to be a common error at the present time, that of painting it too black. The first and perhaps the strongest threat to Christianity comes from totalitarianism in all its forms. It cannot honestly be denied that Nazism in Germany, Communism in Russia, and Fascism in Italy have conferred a good many benefits on their respective countries. They spring from the fertile soil of human suffering, and in various ways have given men and women, particularly young men and women, something to live for: they have lifted them out of the mire of national despondency, weakness and disgrace. The young feel themselves to be caught up into something greater and nobler than their own individual lives by themselves could be, and readily yield to the State all the generosities of their devotion. Renewed health and vigour, renewed industry, self-confidence and national pride reborn, are all to be seen, and so far as Germans, Russians and Italians are concerned, are to be welcomed as changes good in themselves. But they are bought at a price, a heavy price to our way of thinking. In none of these countries may a man openly think what he likes, or say what he thinks, or do what he wills, unless it is identical with and permitted by the will of the dominant party. The individual exists in, for, and through the State, apart from which he has no value. The race, the nation, the party stand supreme, demanding and receiving complete self-surrender, a devotion of service that knows no limitations.

This is fundamentally at issue with Christianity, which holds that human personality has value in itself: we are sons of God and heirs of eternal life. Ultimately to the Christian the State exists for the individual, in the sense that it provides him with the means of livelihood and protection, but recognizes a region

into which it has no right to enter and over which it can exercise no control. 'Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and unto God the things which are God's,' said Christ, showing clearly that He recognized the two provinces. Hitler would doubtless be prepared to accept this text so long as it is definitely understood that Caesar may take everything and God may have the rest. Stalin, more logical and more clear, denies the existence of God, and so naturally takes all. Mussolini declares that Fascism has not got a theology but it has a moral code; he goes on later to explain that Fascism accepts some kinds of Gods but not others; if we do that, we arrive in a theology after all. Behind his fuliginous style he means that the only true God is a Fascist, and Mussolini is his prophet, which is not good Catholicism, and it is not surprising that relations between the Duce and the Pope are becoming strained. There can be no compromise or conciliation between totalitarianism and true Christianity, for they are at bottom opposed. Even the view advanced by the Bishop of Gloucester, so far as I understand it, *viz.* that Christianity is so entirely concerned with the next world that it can have no proper interest in this, will not work : it is a view which condemns every Christian martyr from Stephen onwards. No, Christianity has to face a struggle over a wider field and of severer intensity than any perhaps it has yet known. Bound up with it is the hope of democracy. To conceal these truths is to mislead the people.

It will not do merely to throw our stones at our neighbours in Europe, to wrap ourselves in the robe of our own righteousness, and to thank God that we are not as these other men are. We have our would-be totalitarians at home, both in the right and the left wing of our politicians : only a few are consciously totalitarians, but many more are unconsciously so. We should, I think, see a strong Fascist party form itself if ever Labour came into power with an absolute majority; nor should I be other than apprehensive for true freedom if some sections of the Labour party had their own way. For the truth is that materialism in the decay of Christianity has taken a strong hold upon many in all classes, and materialists have no use for the freedom of other people. If they were given full opportunity, we should soon see.

To turn away from the grave international dangers which confront democracy, and its true inspirer, Christianity, one is commonly told that the Church is faced by so great a relaxation and change of morals as to amount to a rejection of Christian morality by the modern world. Social philosophers like Bertrand Russell, and novelists like Aldous Huxley, are quoted and held up as if they were unquestioned prophets and leaders of the young generation. Statistics are quoted from the divorce courts. The family is spoken of as an institution that is doomed. In all this there seems to me to be much exaggeration. After all the tragedies and disasters of humanity there has followed a relaxation of sexual morality, and it would have been surprising indeed if the sufferings of the Great War had not brought this in its train. I think, too, that it has to be admitted that the standards of a certain section of society, and among them a certain section of the intellectuals, are extremely loose, and as I should say, rotten. But their example does not spread to the mass of the nation, save in so far as it acts healthily as a warning example. The pictures of a future society with free love, limited parenthood, and no family life are, so far as I have read them, so extremely unalluring that they make no converts. The disasters and public unhappiness of our antinomians are so patent that young people, even though they may be about most things vague, see clearly one path that it would be wise not to follow, and will avoid it. The cinema admittedly is aphrodisiac, and some newspapers sensational and salacious. But both are below the intelligence and the moral standard of the public for which they cater, although they do not know it. It is right for the Christian teacher to take note of all these unpleasant and nasty features of the modern world, but it is not at all necessary to lose one's head about them and to fear them overmuch.

A far more serious position from the point of view of the Church is revealed in the indifference of the mass of the laity to its institutional life. These sheep are not an example of good feeding: in these days they are not hungry, and do not look up. They are ignorant and content to remain ignorant, or they have knowledge, and are not satisfied. It is not a pleasant task to find fault with the Church, and, for that matter, if fault-finding could cure the evil it would have been cured long ago. There has in-

deed been too much fault-finding and too little constructive suggestion. Still, I will repeat some of the common criticisms which are not without some substance, since it serves no purpose to bury one's head in the sand. There is a decline in the quantity and the quality of the ordinands, and nearly half of them lack a University degree of any sort: among the remainder First and Second Class Honours men are rare. A field of this sort is not a good soil for producing knowledge and leadership. The interests of a large number of the clergy to-day are quite foreign to those of the laity, who are estranged because they can neither understand nor approve what is said and done. Congregations are said to be not more than a quarter of what they were before the War, and young people drift rapidly away from institutional Christianity as soon as they come to the age of indiscretion. The clergy as a whole overestimate sacramentalism, ritual and dogma, and they underestimate learning, culture and example. They have in the past defended such a series of untenable last ditches that they are suspect as obscurantists, and rightly deprived of leadership because the idea of a faith in all respects once for all delivered in a remote period of past time runs counter to every instinct of the modern mind. All this is not peculiar to the Church of England; it applies in varying degree to all Christian communions. I have stated it unwillingly, because it goes against the grain to criticize those who are engaged on a very difficult task: moreover I think that what I have said needs some qualification in order to be quite fair, and we must not forget that there are shining exceptions, clergy who are true scholars, clergy who are real leaders, clergy who have caught the veritable spirit of Christ. But taking the whole indictment into consideration, if I were on a Grand Jury I should return a True Bill.

It is my impression that there are many in this modern world who are not merely frivolous and self-seeking. If they think, as many of them do, they cannot but be gravely troubled by the experience of the War, and the inability of humanity to exercise its reason in such a way as to make a recurrence impossible. Can a God who permits these things be either all loving or all powerful? And they are oppressed by the vastness of the Universe as science more and more reveals the infinities of space and time.

The contemplation of the universe of the astronomers leaves one with a sense of utter insignificance, and many must sympathize with the words of Pascal:

> 'When I consider the short duration of my life swallowed up in the eternity before and after, . . . the small space which I fill, or even can see, engulfed in the infinite immensity of spaces whereof I know nothing, and which know nothing of me, I am terrified, and wonder that I am here, rather than there, for there is no reason why here rather than there, or now rather than then. Who has set me here? By whose order or design have this place and time been destined for me? . . . The eternal silence of these infinite spaces alarms me.'

Or if a man stands as I had the fortune to stand last summer on the brink of the Grand Canyon, and look down on the whole record of geological time set out as in a diagram a mile high, seeing there the record of the labour of infinite ages before life came, in which a thousand years are but a day, watching the river in its eternal task of cutting through the archaean rock, he cannot but feel himself to be the insignificant creature of a moment, and bow his head before mysteries too great for him. What trivialities are engaging the attention of the Christian Churches, and dividing them one from another! Is not this a natural reflection for anyone who passes from the contemplation of these infinities to consider the pettiness of our ephemeral interests? This sort of feeling obtains more widely than is thought in the modern world.

However, I must not pursue this line of thought further, even though I leave it incomplete. I have so far been painting the picture in rather dark colours, but happily the colours which the present age displays are not all dark, and I should be wrong if I omitted the considerations that may comfort us. And here is one which is partly dark, and partly bright. If I were asked to describe what most differentiates the present time from the period in which I grew up, say the nineties of last century, I should not dwell first on the wonders of wireless communication and all the miracles of applied science which we enjoy, but the presence of fear now, when it was absent then. That fear may be conscious, it may be sub-conscious, in the mind of the individual, but it is there. It is not unnatural that there should be abroad in the land a great deal of the spirit of 'Let us eat and drink, since to-morrow we die.' This moment is all that we

have for certain: as for a future life, whether our individuality survives, or perishes, we do not know. But we do know that forces which we cannot hope to control may in any year reduce our life's savings to nothing, may reduce the cities we have built to ashes, may poison the air we breathe, or blow all to fragments. In what should be a period of profound peace and profitable labour we arm ourselves to the teeth, and prepare like moles our burrows underground. I take this comfort from the present need and distress of the peoples that once before in history the coming of Christianity cast out fear from the world. It brought the gift of love, joy and peace, and if its spirit can be recaptured, if we can renew our faith that we have our part in the eternal Kingdom of God, love, joy and peace could again return to humanity.

We must not allow ourselves to forget the brighter side of the picture. There is more practical Christianity to be seen at work to-day than ever before in Christian history: the good Samaritan is not an uncommon spectacle, and life in spite of unemployment and distress and fear is for nearly all a friendlier and happier experience. There is a chance of education for everybody in the sense that ability cannot to-day be kept down by lack of opportunity. And schools are happier places, where fear and compulsion do not reign as they did, where friendship and help are offered, where conditions are in danger of being too easy rather than too hard. Mr. Claude Mullins in the interesting paper which he contributed last year on Christianity outside the Churches gave convincing instances of the beneficial change that has come over the administration of justice. He spoke of the reform of the prisons, of the introduction of the principle of probation, of the spirit of forgiveness and help. One can point to the magnificent if not faultless hospital service of the present day, of the growth of playing fields and the means of healthy amusement in the open air, of all the work done to help young boys and girls in club movements of every type. Or one can turn to the whole record of social legislation, and the protection which it affords against accident and illness, the worst distress of unemployment, and the anxieties and helplessness of old age. Is there a country in which greater kindness is shown to children and to animals? If Christianity is not the making

of a profession, but the following of a way of life, then is there not to-day some danger that the Christian teacher in his attitude to the modern world may fall into the mistake of John :

> 'Master,' he said, 'we saw one casting out devils in Thy name: and we forbade him, as he followed not with us. And Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not: for he that is not against us is for us.'

Surely there lies great comfort : the modern world in much that it does, in all that it desires most, in its heart, is not against us : it is for us. There is no need to despair.

Yes, it is answered, and indeed it has been said more than once in previous conferences, this is all very well, but we are living on our Christian capital. Helpless Abyssinian natives blinded with mustard gas, Spanish women and children, maimed and mutilated, rise up to bear witness as to the real spirit of the age. There is going on a struggle between humane civilization and barbarism that it has hitherto tamed : the beast in man is mutinous, he sees power in his grasp such as he never dreamed of, he attacks all morality and threatens to reject all control. I can only repeat my conviction that there is no need to despair. When did we accumulate all this capital? when were we so Christian that we were able to put by our unspent surplus? was it when we flourished by the slave-trade? was it when we worked women and children to death in our factories? in the hungry forties? when we offered to old age the amenities of the Poor-house? when we transported a man for stealing a hare? No, it is a delusion to talk about the accumulation of Christian capital in that period, even if the middle-class did go to church every Sunday, and read the Bible every day. But the same spirit that cast out all those devils one by one is still operating amongst us and is still finding devils to cast out, that same Spirit which shall lead us into all truth. Is there any doubt that this nation would to-morrow cast away all its bombers and fighting planes, its gas-factories and explosives, and swear to have done with war for ever, if it could be certain that liberty would be assured, and good faith be honoured? Imperfectly, but in a real sense our nation is Christian in disposition : it is stumbling towards the true way of life. And these are great days, days of great fear, but also of great hope. Instead of talking of the impending bankruptcy which awaits those who live upon their capital, I

would rather approach the problem of Christian education in the spirit of the verse from Cowper's hymn.

> Ye timorous saints, fresh courage take,
> The clouds ye so much dread
> Are big with mercy, and will break
> In blessing on your head.'

It is high time to come to practical considerations, although I do not come before you as one who has an Education Bill in his pocket, or who thinks that by a few enactments and rearrangements the whole situation can be changed. It is clear, and to me it is scarcely disputable, that the main battle is to be fought in the ordinary schools of the country. It is agreed, or at any rate it is not contradicted, that the children who do go to Sunday School do not remain attached to the Church congregation when they leave, and that Church congregations are by no means what they were. A scheme of instruction which works through ordinary Church machinery could at best only reach a minority of the population, and the same would be true if we added to the Church of England all the Free Churches as well. The Church as a result of praiseworthy activities in the past, when it was first in the field, is saddled with the maintenance of many voluntary school buildings, and this in this age when the standard of building and equipment in elementary schools is very rightly rising fast, is a burden greater than it can adequately bear. I am not very impressed by the policy of building and maintaining a number of Church Central Schools, since this too only touches a fraction of the people, and is doomed to be starved through inadequate financial support. I believe that the right policy for the Church is to hand over the whole of its schools to the State, and to concentrate all its efforts on the training of teachers, so that there will enter the educational services a steady supply of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, who will come to their work as a vocation and regard it not as drudgery, not as a display of technique, but as a means of bringing children to God.

There is no doubt that if this country continues to prosper, there will be established for all children, two stages of education, an elementary stage, terminating in the twelfth year of life, and a continuation course (I do not call it a secondary course), which will come to be of four years' duration. Those who know

what education can do, will never be content with less. The beginnings of this continued course exist already, and it is here that through its best teachers the Church must concentrate its efforts, here that the citizens of the future must be made. After sixteen, work for wages, and vocational and technical instruction, await the children, but between twelve and sixteen they can receive a stamp which will not lightly be effaced.

The life of the school itself will be the means of teaching Christian values in the only way in which they can be permanently taught, for they that do the will shall know the doctrine.

Experience has led me to believe that a determined effort must be made to recover the knowledge of the Bible which formerly existed, and the influence for good which it exerted in the national life. I am bold enough to think that the Bible, both Old and New Testament, having passed through the crucible of modern criticism, has emerged even more impressive than before, though much less easily understood. It is not an easy task for a teacher to qualify himself to be a competent exponent of the subject so that his pupils may form a clear notion of the progressive manifestation of God, and of the unique contribution made by the Prophets to the religious ideal. Nor can one in half an hour of an evening's reading learn much about the relations in which the Gospels stand to each other, or master Pauline or Johannine doctrine. The majority of teachers to-day profess incapacity or conscientious objections, when asked to teach Scripture : in most cases it is an honest sense of incapacity that is the obstacle. Hence, while there need not be much difficulty in teaching the parables and the simple Gospel story to little children in the elementary stage, there is needed for all schools which carry their pupils to sixteen or beyond a class of specialist teachers who have gone through at least a year's preparation of intensive study. And here too the Church of England could help the cause of national education by organizing and providing the courses.

Nor must the opportunities provided by the pulpit be forgotten, though much there must depend on the character of the congregation and the qualifications of the preacher. I have heard that the standard of the General Ordination Examination

is not too high, and the task of Biblical criticism is not for everybody or for all occasions. I should, for instance, regard it as unfortunate if Christmas morning were used as an occasion for expounding the arguments for and against the Virgin Birth. But an occasional series of addresses at a suitable time would be useful, both in exciting interest and in spreading truth, and I cannot but feel myself that a very short introduction to the Lessons of the day recited before the passage is read, would greatly help a congregation to understand more intelligently what they hear.

But it is not by this expedient or by the other that the Christian teacher would convert the modern world. Christianity, said the Archbishop of Canterbury, in his broadcast appeal, is 'not to make a profession, however sincerely; it is to accept a vocation.' Christianity is a way of life, and it is for the schools to become a way of life, preparatory to higher things to come. Neither by more Scripture teaching nor by more catechism learning, can it be done: these lessons can be forgotten and discarded as childish things. But the boy, grown man, will never forget the way in which he was taught to live, and will graduate into Christianity, even though it may not be the narrow institutional form with which he associates it too much to-day. This spirit, this conception of a school life dedicated to spiritual values is alive in the schools to-day, and is spreading quickly. Though the Headmasters are nearly all laymen, I think that they are more sensitive to spiritual needs than those who fifty years ago, though in Holy Orders, prescribed for most of their pupils a static Christianity which was rarely assimilated. I assert this without forgetting that there were notable exceptions. I could quote many examples of men known to me, in every type of public school, secondary day school, elementary school, who are in various ways according to their varying opportunities seeking to interpret this vision. They are none of them satisfied with humanism, which they believe, and rightly in my opinion, to be incapable of standing the strain of modern life and its perilous problems. One describes the ideal of his work to me as the promotion of the growth of the soul towards good. Another has described the purpose of his school as that of training the boy's faculties of response to the environment outside him-

self, and defines such response as 'the answering thrill which goes out to meet that which is challenging to the intellect in the mysteries of the universe, that which is beautiful in nature, and art, and that which is lovable in human nature and in God.' All subjects fall into their places as leading to the apprehension of the Divine, though they be imperfect feelings after the infinite, and all the life is designed to be lived as in a community whose members seek to help one another, without fear but not without joy. Surely there is no need to despair, for this spirit could not be present in the schools if our country were at bottom pagan and indifferent to Christianity. There may be coming, and I think that there are coming, great changes both in the Christian Church and in human society. But let us never lose heart, since out of the present distresses there may at last emerge a Church which is alive, and a Christianity which looks not back in the past, but forward to the Kingdom of God.

THE RELIGIOUS IDEAL OF EDUCATION

By J. T. Christie, Esq., M.A., Headmaster of Westminster School.

THE title of this paper which you have kindly invited me to contribute to your Conference was not of my choosing, and I am not sure what you are expecting from it. The Religious Ideal of Education might imply a discussion of present-day aims of Education on its religious side: *i.e.* what effect we are hoping for from the religious instruction and religious observance which we have at our schools—an interesting and familiar subject but not the subject of this paper. Or the title might reasonably raise the question, what religious ideal should the Christian educator have before him in his effort to send out Christian citizens from home or school into the world at large. That question we shall certainly touch upon. But it is not quite the present point of approach. I want to try and go behind questions of School Chapel or School Divinity lessons, even behind specifically Christian issues, and to suggest that Education in itself, *qua* Education, if rightly viewed, commits us to some positive attitude towards Religion in the widest sense: and that it therefore behoves us not merely as would-be Christians, but as sound educators, never to forget the central significance of Religion in any process which can be called Education. This is by no means a truism to-day: explicitly, and still more explicitly, men are denying it. I am not thinking so much of the Nazi or Communist doctrines with their fierce repudiation of Christianity, because, though they reject the Christian tradition, they put in its place something which bears many marks of a real, though misguided, religion. I am thinking more of the doctrine which treats religion as a subject too vague and too personal to be taken seriously by a modern educator, and believes that education properly speaking can only be applied to special skills or faculties, and that thus the best educated pupil is the one who has been trained to achieve the maximum success at the special subject he happens to be best fitted for. This certainly seems to me to be the tacit assump-

tion which lies behind much specialized sixth-form teaching to-day. I believe it is a dangerous and false assumption, and we can only deal with it by trying to show that it is false, not on religious grounds because the chief offenders would not accept them as valid, but on strictly educational and psychological grounds.

Let us begin by reminding ourselves that education in the accepted sense of the word, in civilized countries to-day, is only a systematized and cultivated form of a great natural process to which every child, civilized or uncivilized, is being subjected, unconsciously and willy-nilly, by the pervading influence of the environment to which he must learn to adjust himself. Systematic education must never become so highly organized that it loses touch with this great unconscious all-pervading educative force of environment, any more than a gardener in a greenhouse can afford to forget the great laws of growth which are as valid for the orchid as for the wild rose, however skilful he may be in potting and pruning. A headmaster certainly has continually to remember that however well regulated in detail he may think his school to be, a very large part of true education will be going on beneath the surface, beyond the reach of time-tables, and organization. The word education comes from 'e-duc-are,' which never meant and never could mean—pacè many speech-day orators—to draw out, which is 'e-ducere.' The root meaning of educare is apparently 'to make plants grow,' which recalls us to our gardening metaphor. We must indeed cultivate our garden: but whether we cultivate it well or leave it wild, the earth will continue to make the plant grow: and the garden flower has more in common with the wild herb than we always remember. I sometimes used to feel when I was a University tutor that certain specimens from our schools were indeed brilliant blooms, but they were cut flowers in a vase, snipped off at the root and protected from rude airs by silver paper.

But what has all this to do with Religion? The connection is this. *First*: in the religious aspect of education more than anywhere else it is necessary to keep steadily in view this relation between the natural needs of the religious instinct at each stage of growth and the systematic training which we supply,

in fact between what I have called the wild and the cultivated. And *secondly*, in religion above all it is important to remember and always to allow for, the vast imponderable influence of the unconscious, unsystematized education provided by the community all around. Let me illustrate my meaning in a more concrete way, and consider these two aspects, the wild and the cultivated, first at the infantile stage and then at the adolescent stage. What we shall find is that a religious ideal of education at these two representative stages of growth has been effective, or ineffective, just in proportion as it has, or has not, taken into account the religious development natural to the given stage.

It cannot be seriously disputed that there is in the mind of the very young child something which, without wishing to beg the question, we may call a religious instinct. Even the agnostic, or the atheist, admits the existence of it in the child's mind, though in his view it may have no reference to reality and be as illusory as the lion in the rose-garden. The instinct may not make for good; it may be, and often is, closely bound up with unconfessed fears and fantasies. But there it is, this sense of unseen Powers around the child. It is, after all, only what we should expect by a comparison with the notions of backward races: and any visitor to a nursery can testify to it from his own experience: the spirits who inhabit the door-handle and the electric light: the god who is heard in a thunderstorm — 'Mr. Grumbler' my daughter called him, quite unprompted. And higher ideas of God can very easily be grafted on at this stage as long as they are simple enough. 'The two nicest people I know,' said a child of four to her mother, 'are God and Trotty,' Trotty being the nurse. In many homes thirty years ago, and in some to-day, that remark would have been branded as irreverent and met with a 'shocked' face, thus suppressing this little growth of religion in its wild state; and possibly the chance would have been taken to impress — all with the best intentions — some fragment of dogmatic theological religion for which the tender mind was absurdly unprepared.

This, I believe, is the way in which permanent harm is done to the natural growth of a religious ideal. It has two effects: first, the religious instinct will not find a natural outlet in any religious observance but will satisfy itself with stealthy games

of Jack the Giant Killer under the table during family prayers: and secondly mature Christianity, as represented by adults, will be associated with what is compulsory and full of prohibitions. There are many to-day suffering from repressed religion: repression and arrested development of this instinct towards the unseen will result quite as surely in frustration and phobia as the repression of other social instincts.

We may now turn to adolescence, assuming that the development of religion has proceeded naturally and normally thus far. I am no psychologist, and I write far from reach of any psychological books of reference: but I suppose it is beyond dispute that with adolescence we reach a stage when the idea of the 'pack,' the social group, becomes dominant, and with it the notion of duty to the tribe, and the necessity for communal rules and regulations. It is familiar to us equally in the gang of street urchins, or in the carefully fostered house-spirit of a Public School. Here the relevance of religion and religious sanctions is not hard to see: it is the stage at which ideas of Law and Ethical Obligation dawn in the mind: we may call it an Old Testament stage of religion.

Now if the danger at the earlier stage for the religious educator was to ignore the natural religion, here the danger is that he may over-emphasize and exploit it, in the name of religion, but in the interests of discipline and good order. This perhaps has been a permanent temptation to those who rule the Public Schools. The Public Schools, like all thoroughly English institutions, give a vast importance to behaviour. All the powers of religion are enlisted on the side of good conduct: sermons are exhortations to play the game: confirmation is a clearing house for past failures and future resolves: and private prayers are an expanded version of 'Please make me a good boy.' I know that this state of things is passing away: but much of it is still left both in schoolboys and adults, and its effects are obvious. It substitutes conduct for religion: it forgets that no religion has ever begun by proclaiming 'you ought to do so-and-so' but 'God has done so-and-so': it centres the mind on self, its failures and successes: and it supersedes the unattainable ideal of the Christian life by the eminently accessible ideal of the good fellow and the gentleman, which may be low

or may be high, according to the varying tone of the community. Meantime religion itself is regarded as an extra, a cult for those who like that kind of thing. This substitution of ethics for religion is one of the worst and commonest betrayals of the Religious Ideal of Education. How are we to counter it? First, by asking ourselves, very honestly, how and why this tendency has arisen. Has it not often arisen in homes and schools because good conduct in the young is a thing very convenient to ourselves and by no means easy to secure? No doubt the days are past when mothers said to children, 'if you do that, God won't love you and you won't go to heaven,' but that is only a crude form of the sanctions which some still expect from religion, thus making religion what the Communist is fond of calling it—'Dope.' And in the second place, has it not arisen because we have altogether exaggerated our own powers of influencing others and have got into the way of looking for 'quick returns'—the besetting sin of teachers? We have omitted from our Religious Ideal of Education the truth referred to earlier, that the strongest factor in religious education is the casual untraceable unacknowledged power of other lives and not the conscious precepts of morality. Our pupils have come to value conduct more than religion, because what we have cared about is their attitude to us and not their attitude to God. No true religious influence was ever exerted by saying, 'Look at me,' but only by saying, 'Look the way I'm looking,' and even then we're tempted to glance back over our shoulder. A man I knew told me that far the strongest religious influence at his Public School was the unconscious demeanour of the master who happened to kneel next him for a year in the school chapel. Moreover, this identification of Religion with Morality omits from the Religious Ideal much of what it should supply to the adolescent mind just at the time when it feels the specific need—the sense of poetry, of hero-worship, of mystery and privacy. And if these natural needs are not fed by a Religious Ideal, they will express themselves in lower and more self-centred ways.

And yet because this relation between religion and conduct is over-emphasized and abused, we should be much mistaken to think it does not exist. The clearest and richest result of the right attitude to God is seen in a life: but the attitude to God

must come first and the life follow unconsciously as the leaves on a tree. It is St. Paul's order: first the great statement of what God has done for Man, and then '*Therefore*, my brethren . . . put on kindness, humbleness of mind, etc.' We are always in danger of reversing the order, and of finding our sanction for right conduct in the fact that it is the conduct of a gentleman, which may easily come to mean little more than the self-satisfaction we feel in belonging to a certain class.

The age of adolescence, we have said, was the age when both by natural and formal education we first become conscious of ethical obligation and a code of conduct. It is also the age, a little later on for most boys and girls, of asking questions. In matters of conduct we are concerned with training the will: at the stage of asking questions, with training the intellect. Here we must distinguish, as before, two forces which bear upon the Religious Ideal of Education at this stage: (1) formal religious instruction given to pupils, and (2) the prevailing attitude in the community as a whole — masters and adults quite as much as boys — towards the validity of the Christian claim.

I do not wish to deal with the first of these, important as it is, because it is a specialized topic and would take us too far from the point. But it is worth remarking (*a*) that the school has come to play a far more important part in religious instruction nowadays, because religious training has almost vanished from many homes; (*b*) that if pupils have reached the sceptical stage, free discussion in groups has as much value as lecture and instruction.

The second raises wider issues. The best possible religious teaching can be nullified in a growing sceptical mind by the consciousness that the adults of the community do not really take religion seriously, and are indifferent if not hostile to it. Such an atmosphere — the indifference even more than the hostility — will freeze up the religious instinct at this stage of growth: and no less freezing, I fear, will be the highly orthodox attitude which disapproves of fearless and searching questions. Once again let us remember the stage which natural religious growth has reached by now. Much has been accepted on authority in the past; the unquestioned myths of infancy, the ethical rules of boyhood: and now individuality is emerging.

The youth is going about, like his immortal counterpart in the Athens of Aristophanes, with a 'what-do-you-mean-by-that' look on his face. It is right and natural for him to ask the most devastating questions. It is disastrous for systematic education to answer him with evasions or conventional pieties: far better to say, 'I really don't know how to answer that one: it certainly is a puzzle, but it isn't enough to disturb my whole scheme of things.' A boy may not think the more of you for such an answer, but at least he will not think your principles a humbug.

Sincerity, that is the young man's watchword at this stage: and this is why the unofficial view of religion among teachers and friends carries far more weight than the headmaster on Monday mornings: he no doubt is paid to be orthodox. But what does the house-tutor who takes one rock-climbing to Wales in the summer holidays—what does *he* really think? Is there anything in all this church business? Well, the house-tutors of to-day were the prefects of a generation ago, and how many of them, mature in every other way, are still shy and inhibited and adolescent in these matters of religion! Their attitude can perhaps be called one of reverence to sacred things: but as Arthur Benson said, 'what is too sacred to speak about, very soon becomes too sacred to think about.' They have never really come out into the open and asked themselves or anybody else those devastating questions which are the privilege of eighteen: the questions have been locked away in a box labelled 'This side up with care.' Once again the Religious Ideal of Education has been shorn of half its power because it has been repressed in its natural manifestation just at the point when it might have become articulate. And if it is not articulate, then it is soon forgotten: and when it is forgotten, then some other half-formulated ideal will enter in and take its place.

This brings me to the main and concluding point in what I have to say. 'An ideal of education'—at first sight that appears to be something which we who have pastoral duties may or may not have formed for ourselves. But in truth it is something which, explicitly or implicitly, we cannot help possessing and acting upon if we have an interest in the development of those in our charge. Englishmen are not famous for being articulate, and often the ideal is unconfessed, even to themselves, but it is

there and it would startle them sometimes to see just what it is. For one man the ideal may be the character that has charm of manner and social ease: that is what makes him happy in a pupil, and he is palpably out of sympathy with what is gauche and unattractive. For another man it will be the character which shows what we rather lightly call leadership: a dominant personality early developed, with plenty of self-confidence which will bring supremacy to the house or group. For others, especially parents, it may be the character that can recommend itself to the senior partner and be 'a good mixer.' Can these qualities, you ask, really be ultimate operative ideals of education, except in the mind of the cynic? Not in so many words: but in reality, yes. Mistakenly, one cannot but think: but the mistake lies not in valuing such qualities, which are in themselves good in their way, but in making them ultimate ideals when they ought to be by-products.

One thing about them is clear at once: they are all different; they are many and not one. There is no single broad ideal at which from different points we are all aiming. This was not always so: the schools of fifty or sixty years ago, with all their limitations, honestly held up the ideal of 'the officer and gentleman' before the eyes of pupils as attainable by anyone of a certain social class, whatever his gifts of brain or body. And in other parts of the world to-day, the militant patriot, for example, is one single universal ideal which anyone can partially attain, and which gives value to all subordinate aims. The power of such a single ideal is immense. If the ideal is a wrong one, then the power it bestows is a danger: but it has all the strength of unity. The strength of unity. This is what our educational aims to-day seem so much to lack. We can observe the lack most of all, perhaps, in the conception of education which I mentioned earlier, which has been termed the secular ideal of education: the notion that there *is* no single ideal or pattern by which we can test the lives in our charge and to which we can help them to approximate. All we can hope to do, according to this idea, is to encourage them to 'make the most of themselves,' as the phrase goes, along their own chosen line. The nemesis that lies in wait for such a doctrine is that even for the able pupil we are only training *parts* of him—his 'accidents,' as philo-

sophy would call them — and not trying to train the 'essence,' the whole man: while as for the pupil without any special talents, we have to pretend he is a specialist if he stays on after gaining a School Certificate, in order to suit the school organization: but we have *no* ideal for him, secular or otherwise. Well may our critics ask, 'What are you all *after*, with your expensive and elaborate education? Two hundred pounds a year. Two hundred quid—pro quo?' as someone put it. In less colloquial language, where are we to find the integrating ideal which will give unity and purpose and consistency to our educational activities?

You can see what my answer is going to be. In some sense, it must be a Religious Ideal. Do not identify this, for the moment, with the principles of Christianity. It must bear upon it the marks of what is in a wide sense religious: that is all I am concerned to maintain at present.

It must, then, be an ideal theoretically within the reach of all. Children enter the world, and come on to school afterwards, with gifts of mind and body bestowed upon them with amazing unfairness and inequality. The ideal of fine scholarship, a great stimulus to some, cannot even enter the imagination of others: and those with weak or clumsy bodies are doomed never to touch the fringe of athletic excellence, practise they never so hard. But with an Ideal before us such as we have been discussing, we all, as a boy would say, 'start from scratch.' Gifts of mind or body may even be a handicap in the effort to live that life to perfection.

And, secondly, our educational ideal must be one which gives scope to the whole personality, and all the ways in which it finds expression—dreams as well as deeds, private aspirations as well as public professions: home life and school life. How far short do most of our current educational ideals fall of this in completeness! And yet though it must be an ideal which gives scope to a whole personality, it must be something more than simply that personality at its best. This needs a few words of explanation perhaps. The existence of any ideal held up for our admiration naturally postulates that the nearer we approach it, the better we shall be: striving after an ideal—a state of mind common to nearly all human beings during a period of

growth and development—presupposes the possibility of self-improvement. Now there is always the danger that the weaker kind of idealist will cease to look for his ideal outside himself and will find it in the self-satisfying spectacle of his own character at what he considers to be its best. He substitutes self-improvement for religion, and idolatry for true worship, for his idol is the image of himself. His motto is not 'Mine eyes are ever looking unto the Lord': but 'every day in every way I grow better and better.' I have expressed myself in too abstract a fashion: but the temptation is familiar and concrete enough. All the saints bear witness to it—this danger of looking into the mirror and calling it God: and they tell us it is the death of true Religion because it leaves out what von Hügel would call the 'otherness' and 'givenness' of God. It is exceedingly common in a little community like a School where praise and blame, prizes and penalties, are always accustoming us to look at ourselves with approbation or the reverse.

Such are some of the qualities which a religious ideal would have, though they would not of themselves of course ensure that an ideal would be fully religious, and still less, wholly Christian. Thus far indeed we might have the sympathy of any reflective educator, quite apart from the religious predispositions he might have.

We might then go further, and postulate for our ideal that it should not be something pressed from without upon minds which have no natural inclination for it, but should — as we have been insisting throughout — be in close correspondence with the natural untrained questing of the human mind after God and His unseen power. At this point we should of course part company with the many psychologists and educationalists to whom God is no more than a fantasy, fit only for those childish minds of all ages that cannot face life without the fancied support of an imaginary father's love. This is not the place even to touch upon the vast metaphysical issue of the objective existence of God and the evidence for it. I am always struck by the argument, made familiar to us by Browning, that the position of the cut-and-dried positive unbeliever presents us with quite as many difficult problems as the position of the believer. However that may be, we as Christians do believe in the all-embracing reality

of God: and no ideal of ours, least of all an educational ideal, can afford to neglect what to us is the central fact of the life of Man, nor to ignore any of those imperfect primitive gropings after it which appear in the developing heart of a child.

Finally, and here we are approaching fully Christian ground, we should demand that our Religious Ideal should in some sense be personal. What do we mean by an Ideal being personal? We mean that the perfection to which we strive to approximate is best seen, indeed can only be seen fully, in the life or character of a person real or imaginary. To many agnostics this notion appears natural but childish. In their view, there never was a perfect person: and even if there had been, it is not the way of progress for any individual to devote himself to slavish imitation of another individual whose circumstances and problems were totally different. In fact they reject the whole idea, familiar to us throughout the Christian tradition, of a 'Pattern' personality. They prefer the idea of making the most of one's self as one stands and not trying to become transformed into someone else, of whose life in this case we have only fragmentary knowledge and who lived in Palestine two thousand years ago.

This is not an uncommon view to-day, and it is based on a misconception: but there is enough validity in it to make it worth pondering by Christian teachers. There is much facile talk in pulpits about being Christlike: and asking one's self at critical junctures, 'What would Jesus Christ have done?' It sounds well, but I vividly remember a boy telling me that to him the words meant nothing. What would Jesus have done, under the stress of some boyish temptation? 'You just can't imagine it,' said my friend, 'and it doesn't help you a bit.' He was right. Perhaps this is a point which presents no difficulty to maturer minds: but it is a real stumbling block to simpler and younger people. 'Being Christlike' does not mean each of us trying to turn himself into a second Jesus of Nazareth, if the phrase may be forgiven. In fact, that is not the true implication of taking His life as our Ideal. What we mean by that, I suppose, is living in communion with His spirit and in daily contemplation of it (the ultimate justification for daily worship)—wholly aware of all that differentiates Nazareth from England and His earthly

life from ours, but little by little catching something of that outlook on God and Man, by means which cannot be formulated, but which we all know, in a tiny way, from the simplest every-day acts of acquaintance or friendship. When one personality meets another, no words — or only commonplaces — need pass between them, and yet we are conscious of a something that goes from one heart to another, of sympathy or repulsion, or admiration. That may serve as a faint illustration of what we ought to mean by communion with a personal Ideal. And we may note further that whatever difficulties the philosopher may find in the conception of a personal Ideal, it is for the plain unreflective man in the street the easiest, and indeed, the only form under which he *can* grasp an Ideal. Love of God, and Communion with Him, is to the average man, as it is to many boys and girls, an impossibly remote ideal, unless it is mediated through a human personality. What help would St. Paul's first converts have found in Plato's 'Idea of the Good'? But I do not believe it is beyond the conception of anyone who has reached the age of reflection to make real to his imagination, the courage and the graciousness, the wisdom and the untiring love that confronts him in the simplest terms all through the Gospel story.

We have clearly moved, by making this last postulate for our Ideal, onwards from the ground of religion in a general sense to Christianity in particular, and we are nearing the end of our reflections. But it would be wrong to conclude our effort to determine the nature of a Christian Ideal of Education without remarking one more feature which decisively differentiates it from many other ideals, though they may be religious and truly spiritual in themselves. We have spoken throughout of our Ideal as something given and static, desirable no doubt and inspiring, like the peak of a mountain to the climber still in the valley: we have spoken of it as something that must provide an aim for all kinds of character and an outlet for all the energies and gifts of any individual. And then we made a jump and demanded of it that it should in some sense be personal — the ideal of a person whose earthly life had a beginning and an end in space and time. That brought us to the Gospel. But now we must go a step further again and de-

mand — but demand is no longer the word — we must recognize with humility and thankfulness that our Ideal now is not static like the mountain peak however sublime, not finished and done with, like an earthly life however inspiring, but is a living present reality. The peak reaches down a hand to help the climber. The voice of Nazareth, though stilled, yet speaketh. This is what profoundly separates the personal ideal of the Christian from any personal ideal which we may find — and the young often do find — in some great historical figure of the past. This is surely the great moment in the life of anyone who is honestly trying —with many backslidings—to apprehend God : the realization that, all unknown to him as to Jacob at Penuel, God has apprehended *him*.

Does all this sound rather unpractical and abstract, all this talk of the nature of an Ideal, when we think of it in its relation to our day-to-day dealings with boys and girls, and their parents, and their books, and their fees and their scholarships? I am afraid it may : if it does, you must blame your speaker, for he must have failed to share with you his conviction based on all the experience he has had hitherto, that there is not a moment of the most ordinary day, not an interview of the most commonplace kind which may not be changed and transfigured by one facet or another of the Ideal we have been discussing.

The presence of such an Ideal in our educational work — of which perhaps we are only fully conscious in prayer at the beginning and end of the day — gives a new value to things we had hitherto ignored or disliked, and sets us free from the tyranny of smaller ideals which suddenly lose their lustre like street lamps left burning in the morning.

The problem of the child without any special excellence or gift ceases to vex us : for the ideal of our education is an ideal for which all must start with the same handicap. And the richest contribution that any child makes is the one that each *can* make — his own personality, quite apart from merits of this kind or that : for, in Tennyson's words, 'Merit lives from man to man and not from man, O Lord, to Thee.' Our ideal is one that can furnish a goal for every quality save pride.

And, finally, when we have done our best and seemed to fail, as happens to all of us, here is an Ideal that reminds us that

God knows better what our pupils need than we do and is far more able to provide it: and that often the best service we can do for them is to keep nearer to God ourselves.

Such are some of the effects that soon emerge if such an Ideal is honestly pursued — however feebly — by those whose duty lies in the education of others and of themselves. Religious: Ideal: Education. They are wide and abstract words round which men weave a multitude of theories. For the Christian teacher what do they amount to but this — 'Teach me thy way, O Lord, and I will reverence thy name'?

MODERN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY

By A. M. Ashley, M.A., Headmistress of Honor Oak School.

TWENTY-one years ago, at the first Girton Conference of our Union, my father was one of those who contributed a paper, and I was in the audience, very nervous on his behalf and a little doubtful whether one of my generation was rightly placed, even in the audience, among such a senior assembly.

At that time he was more ambitious for me than I was for myself, and it would certainly have given him a high degree of parental satisfaction if he could have known that the honour of reading a paper would ever be mine.

I stand here, therefore, with a strong sense of filial piety, and this includes also a vivid memory of my mother, herself a convinced Modernist and no merely passive sharer in the Conference. To her, a gentle but a stalwart feminist, it seemed unworthy of the highest ideals of mankind that women should not fully share in the spiritual and intellectual interests of humanity and, at a time when it was very rare for a woman to say a word in this Assembly, she made the effort, considerable though it was, to contribute occasionally to the discussion.

I am glad, therefore, to begin my paper by this reference to both my parents.

Democracy and Modern Christian Education. I am not one who considers that Democracy has broken down. Rather, like Christianity, it has not yet been fully tried. I speak as one who has the honour and privilege of serving one of the largest, most effective, and in my view most Christian instruments of Democracy in the world—the London County Council. Elective in principle, and using as its permanent 'civil service' many thousands of the most highly qualified officials, doctors, nurses, architects, surveyors, teachers and social workers, the L.C.C. is a going concern, which has immeasurable influence on the life of some seven millions of our population. Let those who say that

British Democracy is played out, stop and consider the manifold expression of good government and practical Christianity afforded by the L.C.C. and by other local authorities; for, much that I know to be true of the high standards of idealism and skill as practised in London, must be equally or more true of our other great progressive centres of democracy, such as Birmingham, Manchester or Liverpool.

Christ may be in the Council Chamber or in the doctor's consulting room as truly as He is in the cathedral or on the altar of the parish church.

In taking this optimistic view, I do not mean that the battle is won, that we have a perfect system, that ignorance and vice, distress and disease have been banished from our midst, but I do mean that standards are immeasurably higher than they were thirty or fifty years ago. If you doubt this, look at the photographs of a group of 13-year-old boys from a poor neighbourhood thirty years ago, and a similar group from the same neighbourhood to-day. Or look at the new L.C.C. playground and paddling pool where Bethlehem Hospital used to be. Look at a modern State-aided Nursery School.

True, these pleasant things are still far too scarce. Modern Housing Schemes bring their own crop of problems; malnutrition, unemployment and poverty are still among us; the Depressed Areas are still our scandal and our shame; but, in spite of all this, I contend that Democratic Institutions are not in general a failure.

Where we fall short, it is mainly due not to errors implicit in Democracy, but to the limitations of the human brain and the shortcomings of unregenerate human nature. The victories, when they come, are due, not so much to the organized Churches, or to systems other than democratic, as to the Christian impulses of love, joy, peace and respect for the other man's welfare which are, to so large an extent, the motive power behind the democratic institutions of our day.

Having spoken thus about Democracy, I must now turn to Modern Christian Education and try to show, as far as is within my powers, the part at present played by Christian Education within the structure of the State, and the greater part which it could play if human nature might have the help of several much-

needed reforms. One might say that all that is needed is the Spirit of God; but in so far as we regard the Spirit of God as acting through the hearts and brains of human instruments, we, as Christians, should give careful thought to practical methods of educational reform.

In Church of England circles, and other religious groups, it is too often assumed that the structure of the nation, apart from the Churches, takes no account of Religion. This seems to be a misunderstanding of the facts, resting on ignorance. On the contrary, there is within our national educational system plenty of scope both for religious practice and religious teaching, if human nature could rise to it. Improvement will be effected not by modernizing or adding to the number of schools provided by the Church, but by the inspiration and better education of teachers, and more particularly of the students who will become teachers of the next generation; and by this I mean not the teachers in the Church Schools, but the whole body of students who go forth from our State-aided Universities and Training Colleges to man the schools of every type throughout the length and breadth of the country.

Before I consider the training of students for religious teaching, I want to guard against too narrow a conception of the curriculum. If the aim of the whole curriculum is firstly to assist the development of all the powers of the body, mind and spirit with which the child is endowed, and secondly to strengthen the will to use those powers for unselfish ends, in so far as this purpose permeates the whole school day, all the activities of school life are religious.

God is in the classroom and the playground as truly as He is in the chapel or with us at school prayers. There is an unreality in speaking of Prayers as though then alone we were acting as Christians, and at other times in some other capacity, and even more an unreality in treating the Scripture lesson as though then alone the children learn about God. Whenever the children, through their school curriculum, come into contact with truth and beauty, goodness and heroism, whether in Art, or Music, Mathematics or Physics, History or Literature, they are touching the garment of God. I think it could be argued that a school where secular subjects are *really* well taught (not merely

with superficial effectiveness), even though little time is assigned to the Bible, is more truly religious than a school where Art, Music or Mathematics are muddled and uninspired, though the Biblical syllabus be thorough and comprehensive.

This may seem platitudinous, but it is, I think, too often forgotten in discussions on the staffing and salary scale adopted in Church Schools. In London, for instance, I understand that appointments to Headships in Church Schools are not made in respect of general teaching ability, *e.g.* from the L.C.C. Promotion List (from which alone Heads of Non-provided Schools are selected), but partly in respect of other qualities thought to be desirable in Church Schools. This practice brings the Headships of Church Schools into disrepute with the teaching profession, and lays the applicants open to the charge of professing Churchmanship as a means to quicker promotion than they would otherwise be qualified to expect. I would say, therefore, demand from your teachers a high standard of efficiency in *all* branches of the curriculum, if you wish your children to be brought in touch with that Beauty and Reality which are more truly divine than any number of Bible syllabuses. Similarly, in Universities and Training Colleges, all subjects may be regarded as having in some cases a religious basis, not merely those subjects directly concerned with Theology.

To return, however, to the narrower conception of religious teaching; here the will of the people, as reflected in our elected authorities (acting often on the advice of experts) has definitely shown itself in favour of including Religious Instruction in the curriculum of day schools; and ample provision, in point of time, is made in the curriculum of all elementary schools, both aided and maintained. In secondary schools, in cases where the Head is not keen, the subject may be squeezed out of the timetable, but in the elementary schools, theoretically at any rate, the subject bulks large. The usual custom is a daily lesson, and the minimum permitted by the L.C.C. is a period of forty minutes twice a week, plus a daily period to be devoted to the offering of prayers and the singing of hymns. Thus the regulations, if loyally carried out, do provide a surprisingly generous allotment of time.

Moreover, as to the content of the Religious Instruction,

83 per cent. of the Local Authorities (representing 87 per cent. of the school population) definitely recommend to their teachers the use of syllabuses especially authorized and provided at public expense. Many of these are very good — though possibly not yet as Modernist as we at this Conference would desire. (I may mention in particular the Syllabuses for the Education Committees of Cambridgeshire, Leicestershire, Lancashire, the West Riding, and the County of Southampton.)

It is thus apparent that though in practice much may be a dead letter, our publicly-provided schools in England are certainly not secular in the sense that many schools are secular in France, or in parts of the United States. That this is so, is largely due to the British genius for compromise. The Board of Education Code, which imposes on its schools the obligation not to give sectarian instruction, does yet assume that religious education is a real and effective part of the time-table, and the provisions of the Code need not, in my view, rob the child of his religious inheritance. For the body of Christian teaching which belongs to all is surely greater than that which is peculiar to one or other of our denominations. The controversies at the end of the last century and the beginning of this, between Church and Chapel, and between Church School and Board School education, surely are, or at least should be, ancient history by now; for all must realize the urgent necessity for Christian people to make common cause against the non-christian philosophies based on materialism, nationalism and force.

I can faintly remember hearing talk in my childhood about the bitterness with which some Christian bodies viewed the aid given to Church Schools from the rates, but I have not within the last twenty years come into contact with people who still hold these views. I doubt whether the younger generation has even heard of these late Victorian and Edwardian controversies.

It is, however, unfortunate that in one respect they have left an undesirable legacy. The Code, by its 'Conscience Clause,' rightly permits children to be withdrawn, at their parents' request, from school prayers and religious instruction. In the schools I know best, it is extremely rare for parents to make use of this opportunity. I doubt whether it even occurs to them to do so, except in the case of Jewish families and in some districts,

Roman Catholics. But in order that this withdrawal may be less embarrassing (either to the child or to the curriculum) the Act lays down that in Public Elementary Schools religious instruction must be given either at the beginning or the end of each daily session.

In the majority of elementary schools, the Bible lesson is, I believe, given in the first period of the morning, and it is assumed that each class teacher will take it with his or her own class, either every day, or as a minimum required, for forty minutes twice a week.

Under some authorities, teachers may themselves take advantage of a Conscience Clause, and may ask not to be required to give religious instruction; but in practice very few do so, as they naturally hesitate to cause the inconvenience to the school which would inevitably arise. As a result, there are many perfunctory and uninterested teachers. This is undoubtedly the most serious aspect of the situation, and the argument most frequently put forward in favour of Church schools, where it is assumed, I don't know with how much truth, that only competent and religiously-minded teachers are appointed. At present perfunctory and insincere lessons are often given; or, perhaps less dangerously, the time normally assigned to religion is largely devoted to other activities, certainly more innocuous than bad religion. I refer to such employments as giving out milk bottles, taking in National Savings contributions, arranging country holidays, all Christian activities, but hardly such as were contemplated by the Act. This mis-use, or different use, of the time is almost inevitable, if teachers are expected to deal with one thing, while really considering something else more important. I don't think, myself, the practice is quite as contemptible as it is represented. Occasional interruptions are unavoidable and may prevent life being treated in water-tight compartments. Our Lord Himself combined ministering to the body with healing the mind. However that may be, a welcome freedom would be given to the teachers, if the clause could be cancelled which imposes on schools an arbitrary arrangement of the timetable; and now that the bitterness of sectarian controversy has largely disappeared, this should cause no great difficulty. Since writing this passage, I see that Canon Braley in his book just

published, *The Teaching of Religion*, strongly supports this view. Pending this reform, Heads might at any rate take fuller advantage of the permission granted, and allot to the last period of the morning, or to the afternoon, the Bible lessons of *some* of the classes.

To pass on to Secondary Schools: here we have our own problems, different from those of the Elementary Schools. As to time-table, we have, of course, complete freedom, and members of staff reluctant to attempt religious teaching can usually be limited to other work, without upsetting the structure of the school day. But we do have considerable difficulty in finding enough members of staff willing and able to teach Scripture. This is not due to slackness or even to lack of interest, but often to that respect for Truth, which makes many of the more thoughtful teachers hesitate to undertake a responsibility for which they feel themselves unqualified. For there is no doubt that the religious opinions of many teachers are in a state of flux. The training in logical thought which they had in their own school days, at the University, and later, and their analytical habit of mind (combined with other influences too lengthy to summarize here) make it likely that in their search for truth they will have discarded the traditional presentations of Christianity given them as children, without having time or opportunity to acquire a more reasoned point of view. And here I wish that the work of our Modern Churchmen's Union were more widely known. For there are many men and women still unacquainted with the 'Modernist' point of view, and ignorant that there is any middle path between complete agnosticism and complete acceptance of the traditional point of view.

To improve the qualifications of our staffs, there is a plentiful supply of 'Bible Lectures for Teachers,' both holiday courses, and series of lectures given in term-time. These courses are organized by the Church and the State and also by voluntary associations, such as the 'Institute of Christian Education.' A useful list is given by Canon Braley in the book I have just mentioned. It is significant, by the way, that the foreword is by Sir Frederick Mander.

But, after all, these courses only touch the fringe of the problem. Owing to home obligations, difficulties of transport,

expense and other obstacles, comparatively few teachers can, or should, attend these courses of lectures, however excellent. I would, myself, hesitate to urge on any member of my staff the obligation to attend any lectures after a tiring day at school. The most conscientious members of one's staff are just the ones most likely to overwork. The daily preparation of lessons inevitably absorbs some part of many evenings, and what remains is often more wisely spent in quite different forms of refreshment, whether music, drama, politics or sport. Many too, both men and women, have family obligations; and no doubt we teachers benefit from mixing as far as possible with fellow-beings whose interests are quite different from our own. I say this because I think the promoters of such courses are often disappointed; they arrange perhaps for an excellent lecturer, and the audience is very small. I ask them to be sympathetic and to give thought to the multiplicity of reasons which may rightly cause the audience to stay away.

Holiday Courses, and Conferences such as this, are perhaps more practicable and certainly more enjoyable, but here too there are difficulties.

It all comes back to the great need to use to the full the opportunities of college years. From eighteen to twenty-two is the right time of life to attend lectures, and in term-time, not in holidays. Therefore, above all things, the energies of Church and State should be directed towards making the years at college as profitable as possible.

I return, therefore, to the suggestion I made earlier in this paper. Let our Church authorities cease to collect funds for building, other than that which is necessary to modernize buildings already existent and known to serve a useful and harmonious part in the educational structure of the State. Let the Church concentrate its money and its energy on improving the supply of well-qualified teachers for all types of schools.

May I mention a few practical methods by which this might be done. One of the most valuable would be to urge the State to subsidize, or to subsidize from Church funds, third year courses in Biblical studies to be taken by students after their ordinary two years' course in a training college. At present students may obtain third-year grants to specialize in Art,

Music, Physical Training, Nursery School Work, and other subjects requiring extra study — why not Scripture?

A second suggestion would be that the normal course in Scripture already taken in many colleges might count towards the Board of Education Certificate, instead of being, as at present, an extra. This alternative, though, of course, allowing far less time for thorough work, would have the advantage of meeting the needs of a much larger number of students; for in the economic conditions of our democratic state, many students cannot postpone becoming wage-earners for another year, and indeed many young people have no wish for a third year of study, but are eagerly anxious to take their place in a free and self-supporting community. I feel we should honour their eagerness and energy and not condemn them for impatience.

A third suggestion, relating to the University students who aim at secondary teaching, would be for a course in Theology, Biblical Study, or possibly Comparative Religions, to be included in the subjects which may be offered for the B.A. degree. A purely theological course, instead of the B.A., would not serve the same purpose, and very few students would have the time, the money or the inclination for both. There are already in existence numerous short courses (for instance, that for the Archbishop's Diploma), but a far larger number of intending teachers would be catered for if the subject might also take its place with others for the ordinary B.A., both Pass and Honours. Young graduate teachers offering, for instance, History, Geography or English, for their main subject, would immensely increase their potential usefulness to a school if they had definite subsidiary qualifications in Scripture. Moreover, it is probably better for teacher and taught if specialization in Scripture allows time for teaching some other subject also and the children will view a Scripture teacher with more respect if he or she is also, for instance, a good teacher of Mathematics.

Finally, may I suggest that the present lack of interest in Scripture is not entirely the student's own fault? One has heard of Training Colleges where the compulsory Bible Lectures are so badly delivered or otherwise inadequate that the students in the back row busy themselves with other occupations or engage in general conversation. If the course counted towards the Cer-

tificate, its prestige would be improved, but, of course, its prestige and value must depend ultimately on the personality of the lecturer. The very best teachers of the Church are required in Training Colleges, and here again, if we are to be loyal members of a democratic state, such lecturers should offer their services to all colleges, and not give exclusive privileges to some. I am sure their co-operation would be eagerly welcomed.

This brings me back to the democratic structure of the State. If we are convinced, as I think most of us still are, that one of the greatest services the British Commonwealth can offer to the world is the proof that democracy is *not* a failure and is *not* played out, is it not a primary duty to take an energetic share in supporting its institutions? I think it could be argued that we do a more worthwhile thing in using our votes, serving on public bodies and paying our rates and taxes, than in contributing to Church funds — though I admit that rearmament does somewhat garble the issue.

In our schools, the training for good citizenship is rightly one of our foremost aims, and there is nothing dangerous in it if we sing with our hearts both verses of Cecil Spring-Rice's poem, 'I vow to thee, my country,' followed by 'And there's another country.'

The Conferences of the Association for Education in Citizenship are inspiring occasions, where it is not forgotten that the kingdoms of this world are but transitory stages towards the evolution of the Kingdom of God. We are fortunate in England that on so many public occasions, both big and small, whether it be the Coronation of the King or the opening of a council school's session with prayers, this truth is recognized and worship and thanksgiving take their part in our daily life as citizens. Let us make clear to our sixth form boys and girls that the Church and State are not out of harmony but can co-operate generously one with another.

One last word, lest my belief in democracy seem almost too confident. I am aware of the crushing weight of discouragement which arises from the international situation. The appalling folly of the nations' rearming, the wars and the rumours of wars, the news of horrors in Spain and the East, the fear of horrors for our own land, all these may bring upon us a disabling

burden of disillusionment, and this temptation to despair may be carried over to our democratic institutions; so that many of our generation, and especially those just leaving school, are tempted to turn aside from democracy to other systems which seem to offer a quicker solution from our perplexities. I am conscious that I (though a junior paper reader at this Conference) can no longer speak for the young. They must face their own problems and seek their own solutions. Their attitude towards life will not be ours. Phyllis Bentley, the novelist, in the most recent of her novels of West Riding life, states this well in her concluding paragraph. Her heroine, Laura, has been in touch with many of the advanced movements of her time. She is faced with young nephews and nieces whose whole attack on life is something new and different from all that has seemed to her most worthy of admiration. It therefore becomes her aim to think out and state clearly the ideals of her own generation, if only as 'a standard of comparison for the new idealogies.' To continue the quotation:

> 'It should be Laura's part gladly to set the next generation free to choose its own ideal of life having possessed them of the highest form of her own. Had her generation really given its own ideals painfully acquired of liberty, justice, truth, intensified awareness, a fair showing? Laura rather thought not.'

So too, at this Conference, I should say that we who are in the forties or older should face the fact that in many respects we do not speak the same language as the young people now in college or just leaving our sixth forms; but at least we should take this opportunity to state as plainly as we can the truth as we see it. This I regard as the most useful function of this Conference of ours.

THE PLACE OF PSYCHOLOGY IN RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

By Basil A. Yeaxlee, M.A., B.Litt., Ph.D., University of Oxford Department of Education.

WHEN Jesus summed up the Law and the Prophets in the twofold commandment to love God and neighbour He spoke to people for whom religion dominated life and all education was religious education. The Jew regarded the Law as the supreme self-revelation of God, demanding whole-hearted response from the community and the individual in the spirit manifested by the Prophets. It was to the achievement of character and service shaped and guided by the knowledge of God and of His purpose for the whole world that a boy's education at home and in the synagogue school was directed. Hebrew psychology, though primitive, did not separate body and soul as the Greek did, and the religion of both the Law and the Prophets was concerned with the whole personality in relation to its total environment. As a teacher Jesus gathered up and used all that was truest and best in the educational tradition wherein He was born, but He was in this, as in all else, creative. We have advanced in scientific knowledge far beyond the Jewish conceptions to which He addressed Himself, and the very doctrine of the Incarnation necessitates recognition that He had not, for example, the acquaintance with physiological facts and mental processes that is commonplace now. Nevertheless His insistence upon love as central to religion and life, and the methods of education that He pursued, are more than a matter of genius, reaching by intuition what later has been traced out by study. Actually they express the most vital truths which modern psychology has discovered in its interpretation of the natural processes of growth through childhood and youth to mature personality. They not only sum up the Law and the Prophets and proclaim the nature of that rule of God which it was the mission of Jesus to establish and exemplify among men : they indicate the only satisfactory aim for education in general to-day, and set forth the essence of religious education as psy-

chology illumines it. We speak, in terms that have become all too trite, about the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. This of course is only another way of putting what Jesus said in His formulation of the two great Commandments. The words become educationally and psychologically significant when we remember (and only when we remember) that Jesus was Himself Word as well as teacher. His uniqueness includes the fact that He was what He taught. We learn to love God and neighbour (that is to find right relationships in all respects with each) only as we are rightly related in the whole of ourselves to this Man who is more than the greatest fact in history, since He is the pivot of history. It is through the Gospels and the Christian community that men discover for themselves in Jesus the reality of God's Fatherhood and human brotherhood, so that He is to them quite concretely the way, the truth and the life, the deliverer from fear, sin and guilt (in their psychological as well as their ethical and theological meaning) and the giver of fulness of life (again in every sense).

All this might seem to be a rather irrelevant exordium prompted by notions of propriety or by theological conventions. A moment's consideration, however, will make its appositeness clear. Whatever their differences in theory or technique, all psychologists and psychiatrists will agree that to be healthy and to develop normally a man must be adjusted in the whole of himself to reality. It is affirmed by teachers whose views about method are by no means identical that the concern of education is to foster natural and well-proportioned growth in relation to both the nature of the individual and the whole of his environment. Neither the aim of practical psychology nor that of genuine education can be fulfilled by trying to mould body and mind from without. The inner energies, native propensities and distinctive capacities must be evoked. At the successive stages of infancy, childhood, youth and manhood the individual must find some centre beyond himself to which his emotions, his thought, his will must go out, spontaneously and purposefully. As they do so they will become integrated, if their object is adequate, and because the whole process involves choice, discipline will be a necessary and deliberately exercised means of the self-realization which is freedom.

This, of course, is the purely psychological and educational theory of sentiments, and of the dominant sentiment. If a man is devoted to his profession or is supremely patriotic he tends to bring everything in his life into harmony with his great passion, and will even find his life by losing it. To live one must above all love, and to love one must have knowledge and faith. To educate, parents and teachers must not only love, with the understanding as well as with the affections, with the will no less than with the heart, those whom they are bringing up, but must be able to transfer the answering love of child or adolescent to that which has given meaning and purpose to their own lives — which has in fact saved them by making them whole and uniting them in a beloved community to something of universal and enduring worth. For the psychologist religion is a sentiment; for the teacher and the philosopher it is the sentiment which penetrates, integrates and dominates all other sentiments natural to the individual and the community. Consequently the discoveries, aims and methods of psychology, education and religion are ultimately one, though each has its special sphere and function, and each may take a variety of forms. The important question is whether the religion is genuine and is centred in God or whether it is a pseudo-religion centred in man, as the condition of things in the totalitarian states of the present time, with their appropriate systems of education, or the quality of much education in all the democratic states, abundantly shows. Similarly a great deal depends upon whether a psychology does indeed take the whole man into account or whether it is partial, distorted, intellectualized or pathological, as some too easily accepted psychological theories are.

The place of psychology in religious education cannot then be limited to matters of technique. First and foremost it helps us to understand how children become consciously religious at all. Undoubtedly they have as part of their very constitution a capacity for reverence and trust, a tendency to feel awed in the presence of that which is greater and more powerful than themselves, a craving for protection and security, an eagerness to discover the meaning of things, a need to love and to be loved, an insistent impulse to demand recognition of their importance as individuals and, later, as members of a society. We com-

pletely misunderstand children, however, if we regard such elements in their make-up simply as survivals from primitive conditions of life, when Nature seemed by turns a kindly mother and an incalculable ogress, magic a means of mastering the forces that were terrifying because unseen, and every tribe but one's own a horde of enemies. It is an even greater mistake to interpret every conscious or unconscious impulse or attitude discoverable in a child as a crude or disguised manifestation of sex. The roots of religion in childhood are not to be found in our savage ancestry or in the biological necessity that we should reproduce our species, in fear as distinguished from the natural and necessary avoidance of danger, or in lust, as distinguished from love. They are traceable to something much more obvious — the family relationship itself. From the moment of birth until he is able to understand and to use words a child is experiencing emotional and volitional harmony with or opposition to people; the hopes and fears, satisfactions and disappointments, imaginings and factual certainties which ceaselessly rise in him in this world of perpetual contact with other and older human beings mean more to him than even the pleasurable or painful impact upon him of things in his material environment. When in childhood and adolescence he learns so much from what is said to him he is still most deeply influenced by these more subtle relationships with people. The loves and hates that he develops, the obedience or the defiance that he offers, the ideals or the disillusionments that he cherishes cannot be explained merely by his intellectual advance and his use of his reasoning powers upon the mass of facts and ideas that we usually describe as his knowledge. His character and actions will be determined by what he really and supremely loves, though of course what he knows, in the intellectual sense, and what he thinks, must play a powerful part in making him what he is. But what he loves will result in the main from his daily experience of personal relationships in home and school, church and playing-field, workshop and street, and religion, as we said at the start, is essentially a matter of loving — loving with heart, mind, soul and strength, a purposeful devotion of the whole personality.

Now it is essential that we should meet at this point the possible criticism that in declining to accept the description of reli-

gion as a civilized form of primeval fear and superstition or a socially determined sublimation of psycho-physical sex impulse, but maintaining that the raw material, as it were, of religion is to be perceived in family and social relationships, we are only projecting limited concepts, generalizations derived from these finite and human experiences, on to infinite Reality, making God and the Kingdom of God in the image of the human father and the human society. There is no answer to that if we stop at the end of the psychological argument. We can no more prove by means of psychology that God exists (or that He does not) than we can do so by using the evidence of natural religion and pursuing the old ontological, cosmological and teleological arguments. Christianity is a revealed religion, but the revelation of God from which it springs is a revelation of Him as Father, and not only as Creator and Ruler. The more we understand human nature and growth, from birth to death, by the aid of psychology, the more congruent shall we find our discoveries with the revelation recorded in the Gospels. There is a story about a woman belonging to a primitive tribe who, on hearing the Gospel preached, said to a neighbour, 'I always told you there must be a God like this.' The point of our present argument is that psychology brings out the truth of Augustine's prayer in the *Confessions* — 'Thou hast made us for Thyself and our hearts find no rest until they find rest in Thee.' Psychologically sound and healthy development, individual and social, demands an object for our love which is precisely what the self-revelation of God in the life and teaching of Jesus provides — a self-revelation in terms of human personality and character in time and space, historically conditioned and verifiable. Sound psychological science accords with vital Christian faith.

If then we turn to the educational aspect of our theme we find three conclusions of immense importance emerging—the difference between religious instruction and religious education, which brings into view the essential function of parent as well as teacher, and citizen no less than Churchman: the necessity of presenting the truth about God and man in terms of the historical New Testament experience of God in Jesus Christ, and only secondarily in terms of creed and dogma: and the impossibility of complete Christian education without parti-

cipation in worship and in the fellowship of the Church. These are far from being novel propositions, but they become more vivid and challenging in the light of psychology. Moreover, though there is urgent need that we should bring the organisation and methods of Scripture teaching up to the level of naturalness and efficiency more common in the teaching of other subjects, greater attention has been paid to such questions of technique than to the more profoundly psychological aspects of religious education indicated by these three points.

I.

It is possible to secularise the teaching of Scripture by dealing with it in the atmosphere of pure archaeology, history, or literary criticism: we may evade the demands of religious education by concentrating our enthusiasm on the structure of the Pentateuch or on the Synoptic problem. Similarly the Christian creeds may be devitalised if they are taught simply as formulations of belief or theological symbols. But even if our work as teachers in this sense is well done, and transforms adequate instruction into true education, what children will make of it is deeply influenced by what they bring to it in the way of emotional receptivity as well as intelligence, interest, and previous knowledge. We are waking up to the fact that the great majority of boys and girls will learn nothing about the Bible, the Faith, worship, or Christian conduct except at school. A recent enquiry covering a considerable area in Scotland showed that no more than about 20 per cent. of the children in the schools had any connection with churches, and when the Roman Catholic figures were included the percentage rose only to 34. The responsibility is felt very acutely by most teachers in all schools and by those who provide and control the schools. Yet neither provided nor non-provided schools, day-schools nor boarding-schools can themselves accomplish the whole task of religious education, even if the whole staff be sincerely Christian, every subject taught in the light of Christian ideals and values, all the community life wholesomely Christian, and worship the central act of every school day. Of course an immense amount can be done and is done through the school, but

we ought not to wonder why the apparent effect of school education is often so small, from the standpoint of religious education, when we reflect upon the other forces at work upon them in other environments. The same could be said by parents whose homes are in the best sense Christian, or clergy and church workers among boys and girls, with regard to many schools; or by home, school and church together concerning the environment afforded by the community at large in business, amusements, politics, international relationships and all the rest.

I am not thinking now of the grosser immoralities or secularities, of broken homes or cynical teachers, unscrupulous employers or fellow-workers who have not a conscience in their work. Nor have I in mind the effect of meretricious films, bad plays and worse novels, of distrust and antagonism between nations and the development of war-mindedness (even on the plea of necessary defensive measures) in all nations. I have in view those ordinary, inevitable situations and relationships which occur when people, young and old, live together, and which most people never connect with religion. Indeed we are commonly unaware that there is anything wrong or unfortunate until the psychologist puts his finger on them and shows us that they are maladjustments, that they produce stresses and strains, distortions, fixations and obsessions, not sufficient to result in serious mental disorder, but actually the cause of failure or unhappiness even from the psychological standpoint of normal, healthy growth in personality. When this happens what we are really being told is that an important part of the material of religious education is, as the artisan would say, out of truth. The psychologist is well aware that recognition of this will not by itself put things right. The Christian psychologist —and their numbers increase—will say that the required re-adjustments cannot be made as you would adjust a piece of mechanism in which there is mischievous friction. Harmony will be achieved unconsciously, by a new attitude and relationship on the part of the individual and the group to that which is greater than them all—in short, to God.

Lest I should seem to be arguing in a circle let me go on to point out that at a time when religious education seems to have

to contend against more obstacles than it has encountered for a generation or two, at any rate, psychological considerations show us that it has more forces working in its favour than we had imagined. For these disharmonies and maladjustments in everyday family and community life are, the psychologist in sists, abnormal. Human nature in its normal working makes for that very love of God and neighbour which religious education seeks to foster, and where abnormalities creep in, the cultivation of such love, which is the function of religious education, is the surest way of re-adjusting the relationships and bringing the harmonised energies into fullest creative activity—the making of new people in a new world. Our point here is that we must be educating the whole child, the whole adolescent, the whole man, through the whole community in all its activities and relationships. Religious instruction is not enough. School and Church are not enough. There must be co-operation with home and community as well.

II.

We are rightly doing all we can to improve our syllabuses of Scripture teaching and in all schools, not in denominational schools only, it is the growing concern of teachers that their boys and girls should be helped to solve for themselves the problems of belief and conduct which even children (in their simple fashion and degree), and certainly adolescents, regard as the point at which religion really touches life. In other words, theology and ethics are inseparable from Scripture teaching and are as essential to religious education as worship is. The world conferences of the Churches at Oxford and Edinburgh in 1937 made this plainer than ever before, and at the same time brought to light the surprising amount that the Churches have in common while the impossibility and undesirability of slurring over differences was definitely and with mutual respect reaffirmed. Most of the questions that arise spontaneously in teaching a class do not involve denominational issues at all. They are too realistic and too fundamental! The difficulty in dealing with them lies in another sphere—always given the willingness of the teacher to equip himself as

well, intellectually, in this subject as in any other. The world is torn between the desire to be directed by authority and the insistence upon freedom. This is not a distinction between nations or a matter of racial temperament. Psychologically it represents a perpetual and healthy tension between normal elements in every complete person. Dictators would not flourish if their people did not fall in love with them because they represent an ideal and embody a common purpose. Democracies would not hold together unless the people who composed them were in love with an ideal also, and democracies must have their heroes. In the realm of religious education we find a revolt against authority in so far as that authority is claimed on a basis of status, tradition, orthodoxy, or organisation. But true religious education is cultivation, through knowledge and worship, of love for God and enthusiasm for the Kingdom of God in such wise that service of God and obedience to His rule becomes perfect freedom. Commandment, creed and dogma may sum up all this and afford reasons for both loving and obeying, but their authority will not be recognised and accepted until the religion which originally gave rise to them has become real to the individual. Once more that is accomplished only by eliciting love. Psychologically and educationally it is vital that Jesus Christ as He is made known in the Gospels, no imaginary hero or idealised and half mythical figure, but an actual man among His friends and among those who insisted upon being His enemies, must be central to all religious education. It is His actuality and livingness that must be brought home to children and adolescents by all the resources that study, sound textual, critical and historical knowledge, as well as personal faith can yield to parent and teacher. To fall in love with Him in the New Testament sense of love—*agape*, not *eros*—is the essence of religious education. All the rest will follow, the true understanding of God and man and right relationships with both, the meaning of the Church and the joy of worship, standards of conduct and the discovery of power to live in accordance with knowledge. His is the only authority that shines by its own light and wins a spontaneous unreserved obedience.

III.

Religion without worship and Churchless Christianity are contradictions in terms. Experience amply bears out apostolic teaching about this. But much that goes by the name of religious education treats both worship and membership of the Church as minor matters. Psychologically, both are essential to integration of personality and fulness of life. If true worship and real membership are lacking they will be replaced by some sort of idolatry and some poorer kind of group-life. May we not say that education in worship and effective introduction to living membership of the Church are the most urgent issues in religious education at the present time? This means more than securing attendance at school prayers or school chapel, taking children from school to a service in church once or twice a week, and holding Confirmation classes. It is strange that on this side of religious education we have thus far taken so much less account of what psychology can tell us about the natural interests, energies and cravings of children and young people than we have in devising syllabuses and methods of teaching. The impulse to worship and the desire to be part of a purposeful company are in the precise sense elemental in childhood and youth. Yet what are we doing to make the experience of worship utterly natural to boys and girls while at the same time pervaded by awareness of the Lord, high and lifted up? How far in what we do are we mindful that a difference of a couple of years in the age of a child or an adolescent will produce great changes in his interests and his attitude, affecting his worship as they do everything else in his life? To what extent have we thought out ways of kindling affection and enthusiasm for the Church not simply as the creation and ordinance of God, or as the magnificent company of Christ's people marching through the ages, but as a part of our living together no less real and personal than home or school? We recognize clearly enough the psychological fact that 'telling is not teaching,' and that in religious education above all it is necessary that instruction should be accompanied by activity on the part of the learner as well as by opportunities of learning not alone by seeing, hearing or doing, but also by feeling—by intuitive and emotional response

to facts and values. Where we fail so often is in the use of our psychological knowledge to make worship and church-fellowship come alive to boys and girls in terms of that particular stage of their development which they have reached. Neither springs for them inevitably out of the love of God and man which religious education is fostering : neither seems to them to play a very significant part in adding strength and meaning to that love. Yet surely both should — and would, if our zeal were according to knowledge.

We began this discussion with Jesus as teacher. How else can we fittingly and convincingly conclude it? The more closely we study the Gospels, especially if we do so with the aid of such a book as Professor T. W. Manson's *Teaching of Jesus*, the more evident it becomes that Jesus is not only, in all He said, did and was, the living truth in which we must educate : He is the supreme exemplar of the way in which we must educate, and which our psychological understanding of those whom we educate serves only to make ever more plain. '*Love* never faileth.'

THE CHURCH AND THE CHILD

A DISCUSSION OF ANGLICAN EDUCATIONAL POLICY

By Chancellor H. G. Mulliner, Canon Residentiary of Truro Cathedral and Director of Religious Education in the Diocese of Truro.

IN 1936 the number of children attending elementary schools was about 5,000,000. In this paper I propose to discuss the policy of the Church of England in regard to the religious education of these children. This education they receive in three places — in their homes, in their schools, and in their churches.

I.

Both the custom of Infant Baptism and modern psychological studies point to the importance of the early years in the home. Religion can be 'caught' more easily in the home than anywhere else. Prayer can be learnt from parents as from no other teacher. The home is the appropriate setting in which to learn first the truth of the Incarnation, and its daily life forms the world where the child becomes accustomed to connect the will of the Heavenly Father with practical conduct. Some of us have been brought up in a Christian home. What we needed elsewhere was religious education in the sense of a continuing, a deepening, and an enlarging of what had been begun in the home. The home was the rock on which the house of our religious education was built. Where teachers in schools and churches have to build on the sands of a godless home, it is not surprising if the building falls. Where there is no experience of God in the child's mind, the Bible stories can only be stories and not revelations of God. Where parents give no example of public or private prayer, it is only to be expected that when the child leaves school he will put away religion with other childish things.

In so far as we have to deal in schools and churches with children from homes where faith in God has burnt low, these considerations must affect our policy. For example, they go to emphasize the great importance of school prayers, and it is one

of the good signs of recent years that more attention has been given to suitable forms of school prayers. Again, in so far as the Church has to deal with such children, we must remember that their first need is not for education so much as for evangelism, not for the teaching but for the witness of the Church.

It is a platitude needing practice that in any Church educational policy the furtherance of religion in the home must have a first place. We have Church organizations to further this end; there is, for example, the Mothers' Union which helps mothers to bring up their children in the knowledge of God. It has always been a disadvantage of this organization that it has left out the fathers. I notice that, in connection with some Day Schools, Parents' Associations are nowadays being formed. This may be a hint to us of a new form of Church organization more suitable than our older forms for our purpose of helping to create Christian homes in this twentieth century. Church Councils, also, have a responsibility in this connection. They have recently been called anew to the task of evangelism, and within this task surely lies the encouragement of religion in the homes. It is perhaps to be encouraged most not by new organizations or by special services, but by an individual ministry of friendship. In any case the home is the basis of all religious education and without this basis much of our labour is in vain.

II.

The part which the Day Schools play in the religious education of the children is a compromise between many conflicting views held by influential groups in our country. If it is not all it might be, a good share of the blame lies on those Christians who in times past indulged in so much controversy that they helped to destroy what they intended to protect. They made religious instruction in the schools a controversial subject, which teachers were tempted to avoid and educationalists to regard as a hindrance and not a help to the proper development of education. It is not surprising if religion has sometimes not had that central place in school life which by its very nature belongs to it, if it has sometimes lacked depth, and if the technique of its teaching has not shewn marked progress. The really

remarkable facts are that it has so often been faithfully taught and that the teaching profession has given no support to the idea of a secular educational system in this country.[1] The heritage of controversy was distrust and only of recent years has a spirit of co-operation among those concerned begun to prevail.

The situation is being made easier by the gradual and inevitable weakening of the Dual System. In 1883 the Dual System was really in existence. Many more than half the schools were owned by the Church of England and the number of scholars in attendance at our schools (1,500,000) was more than half the school population. In 1903 there were 2,300,000 children in Church of England schools, which was two-fifths of the total average number on school registers. In 1936 the numbers in Church schools had fallen to 1,200,000; less than one-quarter of the school population. That is, there were a million fewer children in Church schools in 1936 than there were in 1903. The numbers in Church schools are still falling by reason of closures but more especially by reason of the new senior Council schools. Roughly the senior schools take about one-third of the children from an all-age school. Only a few Church senior schools are being built, and we can reckon that the numbers in the near future in Church schools will be under a million and these will be mostly juniors and infants. There is also a reduction in the number of schools. In 1903 we had 11,700 Church schools out of a total of 20,000 schools. To-day we have probably about 9,000 out of 22,000: a loss of more than 2,500. Our proportion of schools is higher than our proportion of children, for many of our schools are small country schools. It is reasonable to suppose that when the vast scheme of senior school building is completed, the Board of Education will — if national finances allow — call on the Local Authorities to improve the standards of junior education, on the ground that the senior schools cannot justify the vast sums spent on them unless the junior education is good. Most of our schools are old, the gifts of generous Church people in the last century. Some of them are quite incapable

[1] *e.g.* the overwhelming defeat of a motion favouring a secular education at the Llandudno Conference of the National Union of Teachers, April 1929.

of modernization and many others are only adaptable at considerable cost to the proper requirements of modern junior education, for example, in the matter of the size and number of rooms, of adequate ground for physical training, and of sanitary conveniences.[2] To keep all of them, once the junior schools come into the forefront of national education, is patently beyond the resources of the Church of England.[3] It would seem probable that within a generation Church schools will become a small enclave in the national educational system. At present we can say that about one child in four is in a Church school; with the senior school reorganization this number will drop to under one in five; when there is a junior school building programme the number will drop still further.

These facts must greatly affect our educational policy. All my life I have heard from Church leaders the cry, Save the schools. What has happened has been a gallant rearguard action in which the Church forces have been driven back and back. We would honour those who have borne the burden of the losing battle. Neither they nor we can give up our convictions that there is no true life for man except in the service of God revealed in Christ and in the fellowship of His Church, and that any education worthy of the name must be a religious education. But the ownership and control of schools by the ecclesiastical organization is not the only or necessarily the best way to express these convictions. In general the Church's work in the modern community is, in this country as elsewhere, by the way of moral and spiritual influence and not by the way of direct control. In any case the control of education by one section of a divided Church was no ideal thing. The limited response to appeals for Church schools, especially to the recent appeal of the National Society, is evidence that many laymen are ceasing to believe in a Church Schools' policy. The question then is what can we do which will meet the situation and be both loyal to our convictions

[2] *Vide* Board of Education pamphlet, No. 107, 'Elementary School Buildings.'

[3] Grants are obtainable only towards senior schools and on terms reducing Church control. The large expenditure in some dioceses on senior schools may result in their being able to retain fewer junior schools, for their resources may be exhausted.

as Churchmen and helpful to the proper life and growth of national education.[4]

In the first place we shall have for some time a few thousand schools. We shall not, I trust, attempt to keep Church schools which fall seriously below the prevailing standards of accommodation.[5] For though in educational circles it seems sometimes forgotten that a good teacher can teach in a bad building but a bad teacher can teach nowhere, to keep bad buildings is not the best way of demonstrating the importance of selecting and training teachers. Rather it is to be hoped that the schools we keep will be a credit to the Church of England. In England we do not worship uniformity, and a group of good Church schools could make a valuable and distinctive contribution to our national educational system and be of advantage both to Church and State. While it would be reasonable to expect such schools to take advantage of their measure of freedom to make wise advances in the methods of religious education, we may hope that they will do more, for where religion is healthy it has a tonic effect on the whole life of the school.

To sum up the Church schools situation. The Church of England was the pioneer in elementary education. For many years we have tried to carry too many schools. Our future task is to try again to pioneer not in the way of quantity but of quality. If this is the right line of policy, then the parishes which continue to have Church schools must regard themselves as holding them in trust not only for their own parish but for the Church of England, and the Church as a whole must help these schools both with expert advice and financial aid. And patrons must be asked to bear in mind that parishes with Church schools need incumbents with a special knowledge of education.

The second contribution which we can make to the religious education in the schools is of an indirect character. Together

[4] Since writing this paper, I have seen Canon E. F. Braley's new book, 'The Teaching of Religion: a Book of Suggestions for the modern Teacher' (Longman's, 3/6). His book meets a real need and his observations, both on policy and on teaching, should receive the careful consideration both of clergy and teachers.

[5] Believers in the Incarnation are not mystics who ignore the influence of physical facts. If the importance of buildings is over-estimated in some quarters, this is no reason for us in the Church to under-estimate their influence.

with members of the Free Churches we are, as Christians, much concerned with the religious education in the Council schools. Recent years have shewn that members of the Church of England and of the Free Churches can work together in this field in the closest co-operation, and also that Local Education Authorities welcome our common help, provided always that we recognize that the responsibility for the religious teaching in the Council schools rests in law and fact on the L.E.As. L.E.As. were not created for the purpose of deciding the future of Christianity in England. Yet if one remembers the religious weaknesses of some homes, the practical difficulties of Sunday Schools, and the accepted objective of modern education as the education of the whole child, one is forced to the conclusion that what the L.E.As. do or leave undone in the field of religious education will have a powerful influence in deciding the future of Christianity in this country. Their increasing concern that the religious teaching should be well given is thus for us a matter for great thankfulness. A number of them have at work Committees specially charged to care for the religious teaching and on these committees there are usually representatives of the Churches and some members who have made a special study of religious education, while some Authorities have appointed an Advisor in this subject.[6] In many areas a new syllabus of Biblical Instruction has been drawn up, and in some areas Church History is also taught to the older forms;[7] some Authorities have issued good books of prayers and hymns.[8] In certain areas lectures have been arranged for teachers. Colonel Martin has recently called attention to the quick growth in one county of adult evening classes on religious subjects, which have doubtless assisted teachers both in Day and Sunday Schools.[9] Under certain L.E.As. the religious instruction is regularly inspected, a practice welcomed by the teachers as giving proof that they are

[6] Mr. T. F. Kinlock, Advisor to the Wolverhampton Authority, has written a valuable pamphlet, 'Religious Education in the Provided School' (O.U.P.; 1/-).

[7] The new West Riding syllabus is one of the best. Two thirds of the 318 L.E.A.'s have adopted approved syllabuses.

[8] 'The Daily Service: Prayers and Hymns for Schools' (O.U.P., 1/8) is an excellent book used in several areas.

[9] *Church Assembly News,* July, 1938. Col. Martin is Chairman of the Leicestershire County Council and a member of the Church Assembly.

discharging that part of their duty faithfully. In such ways the religious teaching in schools is being encouraged with goodwill on the part of all. At the same time it is true that progress along these lines varies considerably in different areas. I would chiefly urge that this part of the religious education of the children deserves from Christians of all Churches the fullest possible sympathy and support. Some L.E.As. need to do more to equip their schools for religious teaching with an adequate supply of Bibles, hymn-books, books of prayer, reference books for teachers, pictures, and the like. The teachers in my experience are often anxious to know more about the Bible, and especially what can be called the modern presentation of the Bible, that they may teach better. What concerns me is that in the Church of England, and in the Free Churches, there should be a supply of clergymen and laymen who are able, when invited, to be of help to the Authorities and the teachers.

The third way in which the Church of England can help in national education is in the provision of good Church Training Colleges. From the Christian point of view this is quite the most important contribution, and it is more worth while to spend money on the training of teachers than on the repair or building of Church schools. It is even more true of religious teaching than of any other subject that it is the personality and convictions of the teacher that count. In our Training Colleges we have an opportunity of presenting and teaching the faith to those who in turn will give the Biblical teaching.

Of course religious education in the schools is from our point of view incomplete. Owing to the fact that the Church is divided, a fact which no one working in the educational field can ever forget, the law not unwisely requires that 'no religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the school.' It is sometimes emphasized that what is lacking in the schools from our point of view is Church teaching. This phrase, Church teaching, is ambiguous. It may mean that certain subjects, such as the Prayer Book and the sacraments, cannot be taught in the school. This is quite true, but it is no great hardship for us to have to teach these important subjects out of school hours. In fact it is an advantage, for it gives us fresh subjects with which to interest

the children. Sometimes the phrase, Church teaching, is used as a synonym for Anglican doctrinal teaching. I should differ both theologically and educationally from some who emphasize it in this latter sense. Since the Bible is the doctrinal source of Anglicanism, I do not think that we have ground for complaint if the Bible is honestly taught in the school. Doubtless its interpretation will vary as does its interpretation within the comprehensiveness of the Church of England. Out of school hours each incumbent can give the children that doctrinal interpretation which he believes and our Church allows him to give. Educationally, much dogmatic teaching has its dangers. A child may easily misinterpret doctrinal teaching, especially as given by those untrained in theology, with the result that when he grows up he finds the definite teaching he thought he received unbelievable, and he loses his whole faith. Alternatively he may continue to believe childishly and he will suffer from an arrest of proper religious growth.[10]

To return to the phrase Church teaching. I would suggest that it conceals and mis-states the really important point. What the religious education in schools, however good, cannot do is to bring the child into the fellowship of the Church. As I stated earlier, one of our fundamental convictions is that man's life is in the fellowship of the Church, and it follows from this that part of the aim of all religious education is to enable the child to become in the fullest sense a living member of the Body of Christ. I venture to believe that many members of the Free Churches, who have done such notable work in Sunday Schools, share this conviction, though of course they would wish the children to belong to their branch of the Church rather than to ours.[11] Church teaching, in either sense of the word, is only one of the methods by which we bring the child into the fellowship

[10] Religious education is an art in which it is easy to defeat one's ends. We are learning more both from the experience of teachers and the research of students. Attention is called to the Institute of Christian Education at Home and Overseas, 49 Gordon Square, W.C.1, and in particular to their paper on 'The Religious Education of Children under the Age of Seven' (6d.).

[11] Hoping for reunion, none of us will wish to draw children from their loyalty to another branch of Christ's Church. We all have enough to do looking after our own children and gaining the interest of those attached to no Church.

of Christ's Church. Common worship is a more important way, and simple friendliness a way of more abiding influence than teaching. The chief value of Church schools lies not in the right to give denominational teaching but in the opportunity, often ignored, to bind together the child's life in school and Church. One of the weighty arguments against Church senior schools is that, since the children come from different parishes, it is practically impossible to form this intimate association between the life of the school and the life of the local Church.

While the religious education in Council schools is in this way inevitably incomplete, what the teachers are doing in the schools is of great value and importance. Doubtless the religious excellence of schools varies as does the religious excellence of parishes. In schools and Churches we all fall short of the glory of God. In a national school system and in a large ecclesiastical organization occasional scandals must needs be. But it is a great thing that religion is taught in the schools of our country and that in a troubled age we are thus far a Christian nation. Religion in the schools forms a vital part, though only a part, of the religious education of the children. A further part must be undertaken by the Church and can be done only by a branch of Christ's Church.

III.

This brings me to the third section of this paper and to the Church's great task of helping the child to realize in the fullest possible way his place and fellowship in the Church. The road to this end will certainly include teaching and Church teaching, worship and worship in Church; it will include corporate Christian action, if only the financial support of some missionary or social enterprise, and it will include the enjoyment of the *agape* of the Christian body. Perhaps to achieve this end with the children we shall have to realize more fully the spirit of fellowship among their elders and betters. Perhaps the one task will help the other. But achieve it we must if there are to be future generations of Churchmen. At least four-fifths of the children will receive their religious education in Council schools, in the course of which nothing will associate them with any Church.

A method which commends itself to some Anglicans is Withdrawal classes. Under the Anson by-law it was possible, with

the written consent of parents, to withdraw children from the religious teaching in the Council school for Church teaching. This right to withdraw has been made statutory by section 13 of the 1936 Education Act.[12] In an important statement on religious education prepared last year in the Diocese of York,[13] it is argued that we should take full advantage of section 13 and withdraw children for Anglican instruction in some Church building near at hand.[14] Withdrawal classes, they assert, 'must be a cardinal point in the educational policy of every Diocese,' and so, I presume, of the Church of England as a whole. If I understand their view correctly, they would not be content, as I would be, to use the right of withdrawal on special occasions only, say, once or twice a term for worship in church, and to use it regularly only where there were special local circumstances; they wish to see a Withdrawal class once a week from as many schools as possible. They propose that such a class should take fifty minutes (including the time taken walking back to school) out of the total of a hundred and sixty minutes usually assigned per week to school worship and religious instruction. Allowing ten minutes a day for worship, they thus propose to take nearly half the time assigned each week to religious instruction. This proposal seems to go too far. It is not very practicable because there are often no suitable Church buildings near the school and because it is extremely difficult to obtain a sufficient number of capable amateur teachers, clerical and lay, who are regularly free at the appointed time. It is idle to suppose that many clergy are competent teachers of children or that we shall ever have more than some clergy with this particular gift. Further, a head-

[12] Together with a corresponding right for children in Church schools to receive at the request of their parents only the Biblical and not the denominational teaching.

[13] 'A Diocesan Policy for Religious Education in Elementary Schools' (National Society, 6d.).

[14] It would appear from the Dorset letter of the Board of Education that it may be permissible for a L.E.A. in certain circumstances to allow the children to be withdrawn into an unwanted room in the school building. The York group do not suggest doing this for they judge the legality of such permission is disputable. It is only fair to add that there is weighty opinion in favour of the legality and that it would appear to be the reasonable policy of the Board to allow a certain freedom to L.E.A.s in dealing with the totally new situation created by the growth of Senior Schools and the decapitation of many Church Schools.

master, who cares for the religious life of his school, will not be enthusiastic at his pupils being withdrawn once a week from the common life and the common worship of the school. It upsets the routine and divides the loyalties. I fear also that to deprive the teachers of half their teaching time will in the long run discourage them from giving extra time and trouble, including, for example, vacation courses, to preparation for their religious teaching, and in the long run it might also discourage the Local Authorities from doing their part. Anyone who has studied the religious syllabuses provided for Council schools to-day knows that the teacher needs every minute of the time allotted to religious instruction and all the help the Authority can give. For these reasons, though in certain circumstances withdrawal classes are of value, it seems wiser to leave the child in school hours to give his loyalty to the school and receive his religious instruction in the school. Out of school hours let us give him a fellowship worth belonging to and instruction worth receiving. Let the teachers do their job and let us do ours.

Thus we come back to our problem. How are we to bring the children into a living membership of the Church, to give them the fullness of our faith, to help them to worship, to draw them into our life and fellowship? The question resolves itself into this: can we so reform our Sunday schools that they will play an effective part in the religious education of the children? If half the children come from homes which are in practice or in name Church of England, there will be about two million Anglican children who will not be in Church Day schools and who will only be associated with the Church and receive Church teaching through the work of Church organizations.

In using the term Sunday school, I use a term we all know for lack of a better one. It may be misleading, for Sunday may not be always the best day for such education as we have in mind, nor is the term school a wholly happy designation. I use the term to include Children's Churches, Children's Services, Catechisms, Fellowships, Guilds and the like. The form of our organization must correspond to the organization of the Day schools. For example, a child just moved up from a junior to a senior elementary school will expect in the Church organization some recognition of his promotion. The instruction given

should be able to take for granted the Bible teaching in the Day school and can concentrate on Church subjects, such as our buildings, our history, our organization, our creed, our sacraments, our services, our duties, and our missionary enterprises.

Something has been done and is being done for the reform of the Sunday school. Thanks to the labours of a few pioneers, the Church of England has some Sunday schools which are effective educationally and has at St. Christopher's a staff college for the training of organizers and teachers. Most dioceses have a Sunday school organizer. Dean Bennett goes so far as to say that we should have such a specialist in every rural deanery.[15] Though this be a dream, I would argue that it is fully time the Church of England took this Sunday school reform seriously. Our Church must be prepared to spend money on what is vital to her future. At present our Sunday schools are not getting their share of our educational expenditure, yet there are more Church children in Council schools than in Church Day schools. Fortunately Sunday schools are not costly as Church Day schools are costly. Five thousand pounds is quickly spent on the repair of a few Day schools, but this sum of money will take a Diocese a long way towards the equipment of Sunday schools, the payment of specialists, and the training of teachers. There can be no doubt that financially the reformed Sunday school is within the compass of the Church of England, once the mind of the Church is made up to it.

A difficulty which is often stressed is that attendance has to be voluntary. This is far from a disadvantage in getting the right spirit into the school and gives the Sunday school a spiritual advantage over the Day school. It is only a disadvantage in regard to numbers. As there are about a million and a half children on the books of our Sunday schools — though the number is falling — I am not disposed to attach too much importance to this point. To-day children are put off by the dinginess and inefficiency of many Sunday schools. We must take pains to make our Sunday schools attractive. With ever more attractive Day schools children come to expect pleasant rooms, interesting lessons, and a cheerful spirit. Also, we must be

[15] In ' This Moment of Opportunity for Religious Education ' a valuable pamphlet by Dr. F. S. M. Bennett, lately Dean of Chester. (S.P.C.K., 6d.).

prepared to adapt the hours and days of meeting to the social habits of the people. The practical difficulties of the voluntariness will yield, I believe, in the ordinary parish to a wise expenditure of a little money and the exercise of common-sense.

The main problem we have to solve is one of efficiency in teaching. It is easier to solve the problem of good fellowship, for we seem blessed with more Church helpers with kindness in their hearts than with wise teaching on their lips.[15] Who can teach for us? There are the clergy in 13,000 parishes; some are teachers of children, and perhaps the Archbishops' Commission on Training for the Ministry will advise steps to increase their number. At any rate all clergy should know enough about education to appreciate what is wanted for efficient teaching. It is asking much of professional teachers to invite them to take another class a week; yet there are always a number of teachers who out of loyalty to the Church freely do this, and their help is necessary to our success. They are chiefly wanted for posts of direction and superintendence, and we ought to find others to relieve them of all secretarial work. I believe that more teachers would come forward to help us if we brought our Sunday schools into line with educational principles. There is also a useful group of teachers who have retired from the profession and are more free to help us.[17] A further supply of teachers should be obtainable from those who have been at Public and Secondary schools.[18] Teaching to-day has become a technical subject and such helpers will need some training both in the subjects assigned to them and in the method of teaching. The cost involved in their attending lectures, week-end courses, or summer schools for this purpose is, I judge, a proper charge on Church funds. It should be the Church's aim to have all our Sunday school staffs in some measure trained, and by a gradual insistence on this aim we shall slowly raise the status of our teachers until to have taught in Sunday school will become

[16] It should be added that club running has become an art in which people nowadays obtain training. Even this side of the reformed Sunday school cannot be too 'amateur,' and love must be with understanding.

[17] Especially the considerable number of women who give up professional teaching at an early age by reason of marriage.

[18] There are about 150,000 Sunday school teachers at present; probably most of them had an elementary education.

evidence for more than kindness of heart. One of His Majesty's Inspectors of Schools observed to Miss Dent that in the reformed Sunday school we should have one of the best educational institutions the world has yet heard of, if we were able to provide teachers who would take every opportunity of training and who were then given small groups of children to teach. His words give us both a hope and a challenge.

I do not propose to discuss further this educational task of the Church for which I have used the label, the reformed Sunday school. Naturally it raises many questions of a practical kind and there are several books which may help those concerned.[19] My purpose in this paper has been to discuss in a broad way the religious education of the greater number of children in this country. I have pictured this education as carried on in the home, the school, and the Church, all three playing a vital part and forming a three-fold cord not quickly broken. As a Church we can influence what is done in the home and we can help indirectly in what is done in the school, but our own primary business lies in what is done in the Church and through its organizations. The bitter fights of a generation ago about Church schools still obsess the minds of many Churchmen and blind them to the realities of to-day. In any sound Anglican educational policy Church schools can never again be in the centre of the picture; they will remain a valuable but minor feature. The York group, to whom I have referred, would agree with this but would substitute a Withdrawal class policy for a Church schools' policy. Withdrawal classes have their place, but it is also a minor place. In the centre of the picture we must put first the Church Training Colleges, where we help the teachers to a living faith, and second the reformed Sunday school by means of which we shall bring the children into the living fellowship of the Church. I have not disguised the difficulties in the way of this reform, but they are not insuperable. To succeed would be to strengthen the whole life of the Church. Here is one of the tasks of the Church in our generation and one in which I believe the members of our Union will often find themselves able to help.

[19] *e.g.* Miss Phyllis Dent, 'A New Approach to the Church's Work with her growing Boys and Girls' (National Society, 3/6).

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

By the Rev. N. V. Gorton, M.A., Headmaster of Blundell's School.

I WANT to limit this paper by asking the question where is the breakdown between the school and the parish — to discuss it in general terms to begin with and then discuss it in the particular. Here is the paradox — the public school should provide the ideal training ground for membership of the Anglican Church. The Anglican Church is the most traditional typical English institution, next to it perhaps the English public school. There, if anywhere, the Anglican Church has its chance. All that the original prayer book reformers planned is in practice. The public school religion is a small-scale working model of their ideals and technique. It draws from the middle-class and upper-class homes, where still survive if anywhere a habit of church-going and Anglican conformity. In the school you have a daily office: on Sundays in the traditional evensong in its very best form with fine choirs, magnificent congregational singing, select preachers; and in Matins — often in a modernized version — you have the community gathered weekly as a community for its Sunday worship. Confirmation is more fully done than anywhere else. I have been to eight different public schools in the last few years and seen at eight o'clock celebrations — thirty, fifty, eighty and up to a hundred and twenty communicants. You have the Bible studied and taught in a background of liberal and modernist criticism. In the sixth forms religious apologetics, theology and a philosophic and intelligent approach to satisfy the utmost demands of the 'modern Churchman.' With it all you have a good deal of the ideal of the reformers in a strong lay element modifying ecclesiasticism, exercising criticism and taking considerable part in the services — in confirmation preparation, in teaching and even in the pulpit.

What more on the surface could the most ardent Anglican require?

Below the surface religion is a real thing so far as it can be real for a community below the stage of mature experience. The modern boy is alert, individual and intelligent — fifty per cent. better than his counterpart twenty years ago. I find myself for once in agreement with Mr. Joad in an article in *Truth* where he said that the youth of university age are more interested in the religious solution to their personal and social problems than in any other.

In the context of its close social life and the ethos which is a part of it, there has always been traditionally in the public school a reference to the idea of God and to the personal revelation of the character of Christ as a thing consciously or unconsciously admitted or recognized. The idealism of youth has in the public school a Christian reference. There is little sense of intellectual revolt against the Christian theology in idea. So far as it is grasped it is seen as something big enough in its intellectual and spiritual possibilities.

The Christian thing is there, to be elicited or to be harnessed through conversion and conviction if, when the boy leaves school, the Church were there in a living form to elicit it or harness it. Yet the fact is that this does not happen. The same report comes from college chaplains and parish priests. For some reason or other the Church neither feeds them nor they the Church.

Let varying schools of critics set their particular criticisms at rest. The Modern Churchmen — that they only need liberal New Testament criticism — theology brought up to date — the haunting fear of conflict between science and religion removed. They are taught intelligently — the latter fear does not really worry them. Or from another angle that boys are bored by chapel services — they have too much or too little of them — some nice readjustment will do the trick.

Every kind of adjustment is made in some school or another. Some no daily chapel, some one compulsory Sunday chapel, some all voluntary. Boys are not bored by good services any more than you or I are sometimes bored. We then go because we ought—we compel ourselves; with boys it may be an external compulsion.

But take it as a whole, they enjoy in one way or another a

good chapel service. I had this criticism made by a friend, a parish priest and ex-schoolmaster, that we ought not to make our services too good because they won't get such good ones when they leave school. We ought not to have an adapted morning service which suits boys, because when they leave school they won't endure full matins. The Anglo-Catholic can't say that they do not make their communions. They do in large numbers. The evangelical might say we ought to 'convert' them on the lines of seaside camps and 'group' influence. But at an immature age the violence of personal emotionalism or demands for final decisions will merely fixate development of character and would be an abuse of trust by a schoolmaster. If successful it would falsely mark a community into sheep and goats.

A good deal more might be done in correct doctrinal teaching — but not along the line of the good Churchman's penny catechism. After all educationally we have to give a boy a right to his own liberties and to train him to think for himself. Finally there are the advocates of a more spiritual religion who ask for what might be called withdrawing rooms. Any system by accident may produce saints, this system by intention encourages religiosity. It identifies religion with the temperamental pieties of the few and revolts the common-sense sanities of the healthy boy. School religion, if it is to be Christian and not pietistic or 'spiritual,' must be a matter for the ninety and nine. It must assume that all boys are religious and interested in religion.

To return to the actual problem — I know this, at the back of their minds is one fundamental and final dogma of their own that to be a Christian does not necessarily imply anything to do with the Church. It is an amazing lap-over from nineteenth century reduced Protestantism and individualism. I shall keep on returning to this as a diagnosis of a mental attitude which is the root of the whole weakness of our position as priests, whether at public school or in the parish in relation to the laity.

Directly you begin to talk about the Church, their moral ears lie back with innate incredulity. The idea of the Church as essential to Christian salvation, their own or society's, is a thing they just don't believe. It is treated politely as parson's guff. My experience is that they won't criticize Christianity but they will always criticize the Church. In the Church as they see it

there is so little of the New Testament, of what they vaguely feel it should be; there is nothing to convert of the Holy Spirit, no sense of fellowship through the services, no witness as a corporate body on the larger issues of life, personal or social. As Christ's essential instrument of salvation it does not seem to foot the bill.

Sometimes, as a public schoolmaster, I just sit back and throw the blame on the parish clergy, on the bishops, on the system. About religion in the school, one says, they are grand boys, they have got the right spirit, the beginnings of faith. That won't disappear; have faith. Leave it to the Spirit, which may deal with them as individuals, or a movement of the Spirit, which may well be on the way, will find in them material when it comes. But no priest in the comparatively easy circumstances of a school can throw stones at the parish clergy. Anyway, we are all in the same boat. Ever since I can remember (and I was born in a rectory) the line of parish clergy has been to concentrate on the young, and the young grow up and present in parish and public school the same subsequent problem. Are we just going on working in school and parish a traditional technique of services which a proportion of elderly people are satisfied with, as they become satisfied with any set of habits, services which had origin and use in an entirely different social and religious setting, which assumed in the society a total Christian family for which the Church had to provide family prayers? A side-line is that the public school within itself largely maintains that social setting and the services there are all right. When they leave school, to the setting of the new ordinary life, continuance of these services seems irrelevant. Does one, to revert to oneself — and most parish clergy in moments of disillusionment say the same thing — does one just for the last third of one's life at the job, sit back, say, carry on, till the movement of the Spirit comes or till the thing runs down (through no fault of our own; we have done our best), or till the curtain rings down on oneself, and do this in the name of having faith? There must be some radical wrongness and fundamental right issue and emphasis we must get down to.

I believe myself it is a matter of services. After all, we are priests working an ecclesiastical system. The Church of Christ

has used, as its essential sacramental means of grace, worship of the community and the symbolism of effective rites. In these its central dogmas of faith are expressed, witnessed, shared and incorporated. I defy anyone to say that in Matins and Evensong you have, for this generation, services which convert with a sense of the spirit those within or are an effective witness of the essential theology to those without. We need above all a new liturgical movement if the priest is to do anything through the Church and its services for this generation. If we are training the young or enlisting the young we have ourselves to face the issue they have to face. Membership of the Christian Church is not now a matter of social habit, nor is the Church itself the generally accepted centre of the family worship of the community. In a revolutionary situation the Church always needs a reformation. A reformation always requires first a return to the absolute essentials and a restatement not only in theology — though that is vital and primary — it is too abstract for the ordinary man, the Church embodies its theology in its liturgy. It is there available.

I return to my school problem — how on earth to bridge that breach of idea between the Church and individualistic faith, to convince men that to be a Christian is to be a member of a witnessing fellowship, bound by continuity of worship and faith to the historic Church founded by our Lord and expressing the will of God for this generation?

At this point I shall stop generalizing and become concrete and particular. To be concrete and particular is to risk the charge of egotism. In any attempt at a real change of emphasis in a public school the key position must be held by the staff. The staff, the headmaster and the chaplains are a product of the system itself and suffer from some or all of its limitations and inhibitions. Boys pass in generations; the staff remains. Without their understanding and support any attempt at radical change in services or in the religious life of the school is merely a stunt of the chaplains or the headmasters and merely touches the surface. We had a series of staff meetings to consider this kind of issue. The line of argument put forward for discussion was that, as a staff, we are a number of individuals all getting on with our job, concerned with particular boys or particular

groups of boys, trying to develop their interests and their liberties. But we are preoccupied with our immediate job, departmentalists. We may, as individuals, worry at leisure over the question of liberty for what? What is it all getting at? But we never do it as a body. Unless we get down to the central religious issue, we may be just going nowhere.

About the boys we are teaching and their attitude to Christianity — they are interested enough but they leave without a clear consciousness or conviction. So far as school religion influences boys personally, it is something for their individual thoughts, day-dreaming moving into something more occasionally. Christianity for them has its high water mark in their personal communions, but they make their communions as individuals, and essentially the Communion Service is a source of individual inspiration. Their Christian faith is not for them at all a sense of being members of the body of Christ, and the Communion Service itself, which should most of all be connected with that truth, actually carries with it the exact reverse association. For instance, it would be true to say of staff as a whole and boys about their communions that they would feel they were making the best communion where as few other people were present as possible—an ideal in a village church with half-a-dozen people present.

But we are concerned as schoolmasters and Christians in educating boys in religion, or elsewhere to play their part in their own generation. Christianity to-day must refind itself as a missionary faith, as it is refinding itself in Germany and Russia, in a sense of membership of a body challenging with the central ideas of the faith paganism, materialism, humanist philosophies, the world and the indifference of non-believers or counter-faiths. Could we get a line anywhere? It is not a question of tinkering or tips at improvement, but some fundamental re-statement or re-emphasis. And it is not a question of teaching, but of chapel services being inadequate to make this link between Church and school—for that matter there is the same weakness between the parish and Church.

Throughout the Christian world there is this new liturgical movement which seemed to be an attempt just to meet this central issue. In Germany, Sweden, the Roman Church, the English

Church and the Presbyterian, a movement in the Church as a whole is speaking the same language, that of fellowship to be recreated round restatement of the simplest evangelical Gospel truths, embodied in the Communion, not as a private devotion or as the occasional crowning mercy of the society, but going back to the primitive Church and to the truth of the Christian Church as a missionary society bound together and inspired by the presence of the Lord.

Laymen's theology tends to be forty years out of date. From reading the *Modern Churchman* I sometimes think the modern churchman is only thirty years out of date. Consistent with this liturgical movement is the best of modern theology and of New Testament criticism. The Barthian truth of 'crisis' again has central rightly theological hammering of the Christian faith as 'revelation,' and not man's vague personal aspiring. A similar theology from the Swedes and the essential conclusions of the Hoskyns-Dodd school of Biblical criticism are reproviding us with a New Testament theology. Theologically, we are no longer in the un-evangelical position of nineteenth century liberal Protestantism—with Christ divided from the New Testament and the New Testament from the Church—the whole an evolutionary incident in man's upward search for a God whose existence may be doubtful and whom it is at any rate unscientific and unphilosophic to imagine as interfering by revelation into history. We are in a position to recreate the Church out of right theology and the Spirit. But we cannot do it by preaching sermons. The lay mind appropriates its theology through the symbolic, the drama and emphasis of its services. The Church has always lived through its liturgy, and has got to recreate it in a new form round the essentials.

But to return from my digression. The point was how to get a right central theology in a setting of the truth of the historic Church, and how to get in the public school, with its intense individualistic tradition, the Communion Service back to its central and corporate setting to embody this theology. Along this line seems the only chance of building a bridge between the public school and the Church. Now it might be thought all this looks like going Anglo-Catholic. I am not an Anglo-Catholic. Still, the Anglican Church has been kept alive spiritually by

the High Church Anglo-Catholic movement, rediscovering worship and prayer and the Church. But it has used the corporate Communion Service as something approximating to the Roman Mass, with largely non-communicating attendance. It does emphasize the fact that the Christian faith is bound up with the central sacrifice of our Lord, and together with that is the sacrifice and offering themselves of the believers — and out of that is the Church. Its theology is therefore central and not circumferential. But the Anglo-Catholic rite tends to be a mystery which the priest celebrates. The altar, true — but the altar removed from the people and the communion secondary. Therefore the Anglo-Catholic tends to be suspect to the lay tradition as Roman and over-priestly. An E.C.U. version of the Church would detach the Church from a great body of English belief. It cannot be implanted on the public schools.

But does this new liturgical and theological movement in the parish communion idea offer a way out which is evangelical and catholic, and which can attach itself to the lay and protestant English tradition? And could it work in the public school?

It is not a choral Eucharist with the choir throwing highlights on the 8 o'clock communion by the interruption of cathedral settings of sub-Christian ornamental music. This is neither one thing nor the other. I know of no service more repugnant to the realism of youth. With cathedral matins it would be a well lost monument of piety. What we want is the altar back to the people, saved from choirs and the English cathedral school of organists, from decorous modern churchmen or public school chaplains, from archaisms, dim lights and mediaeval patterns. If we can make a people's service out of the Eucharist we have something to point to and say that is the Church.

But how to get that kind of fundamental revolution in practice over into the nineteenth century individualist tradition of once-believing English middle-class homes and their product, the public school. The boys themselves from their homes, from the strong tradition they possess in schools, the masters, the school chaplains, myself, all share the same outfit of inhibitions. I find myself approaching the central instruction one gives on the Communion Service, as that which above all helps, feeds and elicits their deepest spiritual needs. That is the existing prac-

tice — the 8 o'clock communion the individual attends as an individual; the main school chapel service is at 10.30 or 6.30, where the community worships or, as a community, says its prayers or is preached to. How break the circle? It is no good preaching about the Church as an ideal or the communion as the great corporate act when in plain practice it is an individual business; therefore the important thing for the Christian is his personal devotions. The corollary is that he can get on quite well without the Church and that the Church is not necessary. You can be a good Christian without any loyalty to the body or any duties undertaken as a member. The Church therefore is irrelevant to Christianity.

We had staff and group and chaplains' discussions on these lines for a term, and then invited an expert on the new liturgical ideas and the parish communion down to talk. He spoke to the sixth forms and for two to three hours to the entire staff. It was a very interesting business. He talked straight dogmatic theology for an hour.

> 'What is the essential thing? The incarnation of our Lord and His life and death as an offering of Himself; out of that His authority as present King and Lord. Sin — not so much in the old terms of consciousness of our personal failings to maintain our own standards or those of a law—but the experience of ourselves as members of a world and national society having lost its anchorage in God and just in desperate need. Redemption — the power of God through Christ to recreate a faith in a society united to Christ and through that to bring His redeeming power into the world. Given that, the liturgy, services, active prayers of the Church and of the Christian are to make him a faithful sharer, an instrument of that redeeming power. Against every alternative "ism" and denial and indifference the Christian can only be a Christian in so far as he enters into that truth. The Church exists to express it, and its fellowship must be recreated round the essentials.'

He then went on to a statement of the technique and ideals of the parish communion. But it was interesting to see the response of a group of intelligent laymen to dogmatic theology. There was a non-dissentient agreement after discussion that the position was right and that we ought to go ahead with it.

There remained the detailed problem of technique and ways and means. My own feeling was of difficulties that alarmed me. First a vicious circle has to be broken. It is no use talking of the ideal of such a corporate service till you have got it, and no good having it till you have the right ideas and convictions. You don't get it by just changing the hour of a service and

adding music and a new name. You have got to create *pari passu* a new theological outlook on Christian fundamentals. I think it can be done, not just by imposing a new service but with chaplains, headmaster and staff being gradually mentally converted, thinking theologically, and the school at the top being helped to think for themselves and the younger getting explicit, something like catechetical instruction on essentials. It must take time to build up. We had a term of thought and statement which gave us time to think out the technical problems of such a service in a school.

In considering the technical problems, some of the major issues raised themselves and they are of interest. Take the apparently, at any rate, non-theological issue of the hour — as a matter of fact it raises first-class theological issues. The ordinary parish communion hour is 9 or 9.30 to suit modern habits and different localities. But you cannot breakfast a school at 10 or 10.30.

Why not have it at 8 o'clock? But here is a vital issue — the ordinary school Sunday morning service is at 10.30. This is voluntary for boys who have been to the 8 o'clock service. An 8 o'clock Eucharist would still be a special service boys got up specially to go to, and the main recognized service of the school as a whole would still be at the 10.30. What you want to get over is that the parish communion is the main central morning service of the school as a whole. Put it at 8.30, at which time boys would normally be up — at once a nice problem — breakfast would follow at 9.30 and something like sixty girls and women in domestic work at the houses would have no chance of getting their work done to enable them to go to church themselves, and apart from that their entire Sunday morning would be wrecked.

What about this fasting communion and the sacrosanct hour of 8 o'clock? Are they an ecclesiastical ramp which in the nineteenth century Anglicanism enabled middle-class people with domestic servants to be devout. Here at any rate we faced its reduction to absurdity on a three-horned dilemma.

(1) You have the service at 8 — in which case you can never get it accepted as the normal Sunday service for the school as a whole, and what you are aiming at goes by the board.

(2) You have it later and for your spiritual satisfaction you deprive others.

(3) You have a non-communicating service, mass without communion, and again miss the essentials.

Alternatively you have it after breakfast at 9.30, making it the central and only morning service, and have to decide whether the non-fasting tradition is one of principle or convention and whether, further, the convention or principle is going to stand in the way of a vital truth. Priests in country parishes could fill up varying similar dilemmas, *i.e.* as to whether you can be a Christian and milk the cows.

The question of attendance — a communion service would have to be voluntary. But as the main Sunday service you would expect a large proportion of the school to attend. A certain proportion would be unconfirmed; of those confirmed not all would want necessarily to communicate. But if from a third to a half of those present communicate the general intention and witness of the service would be that of the corporate communion.

The time-factor — for young people you want such a service to be as near fifty minutes as a limit as is possible. In a school of 300 or so, you may get 100, 120 and 140 communicating at a service. With only two priests administering, you are going to have a long wait in the middle, too long for those who are not confirmed, the younger lot especially, and for others. That is a serious problem, and is it another ecclesiastical ramp — the inability of the layman to take a fuller part in the service and be used for the administration of the cup?

The music — a vital congregational element; start with hymns, and hymns with theological stuffing, greatness and history in them, not those we associate with choral Eucharists. Congregational musical settings — the trouble is the time-factor; Marbeck is the only one which goes the pace of the spoken word. In a school where music is largely Bach, is it an archaism to use plain song? Can plain song which is a mode of its own be introduced into a community whose musical traditions are strong and into which plain song will only unnaturally fit? The only new rite connected with the parish communion is that of the offering of the bread and wine denoting that of

the daily life of the community which is taken up by two members of the congregation before the prayers for the Church militant. It is brought up by a master and a boy and offered at the altar. 'Here we present ourselves, our souls and bodies a true and living sacrifice unto thee.' The offering of wafer bread would obviously remove most of the meaning from this.

To draw a conclusion — the thing is in working. I do not propose to ask myself the question, is it successful. All I know is, I am sure it is right. From the pastoral priests' point of view, most of us have been brought up on Von Hügel, and believe in right Catholic ideals of the Church. We teach them, our people listen politely. But nowhere can we point in our services and say, here it is, so as to carry conviction either to ourselves or others. One can go ahead now gathering, teaching and eliciting experience from a central service which is adequate to the faith. Here is the Church — its ethic, its theology, its attitude to the community issues from this.

Is it popular? The staff as a whole think it right. So I think do the school, even after a short time. Boys are conservative and may regret their idea of communion as a nice quiet time for themselves. As a matter of fact we have the parish communion on alternate Sundays, so it leaves the other Sundays free for the more individual form of communion and its legitimate values.

One other thing, we did accompany this revolutionary change in services by a parallel radical gesture, though again it is not a gesture, it is concerned with truth. We have a late Victorian Gothic chapel, its chancel a period piece of crowded tacked on Gothic. We stripped it ourselves of bad panelling, purbeck marble sham pillars and the art of the ecclesiastical furnisher. We were not concerned primarily with getting it beautiful, but getting it right. There is a right iconoclasm which youth should be allowed to let loose on some of our churches. The removal of sham from the sanctuary seems to be a proper form of violence. Further, we took the altar out from the wall right into the centre of an enlarged sanctuary and set it in the centre of concentric circles of steps. When we have finished it, and made it ourselves, the community will kneel round the altar. That I take to be truth and to be worth stating.

Some people still think that a cross has something to do with the Pope. I was told by a Bishop that you can make too much of the communion service. Some of our ancestors thought they showed a stirring independent primitive Christian spirit by tying their dogs to the communion rails. Some people may think you make too much of the altar and the idea of sacrifice. If the latter is a Protestant objection, it is one that neither Luther nor Calvin would uphold. The central Christian truth of the altar and sacrifice is supplemented by the other essential truth of the gathering of the community round the altar. The two together are Evangelical and Catholic, and such I take to be the Christian faith.

THE ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES AND MODERN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

By Canon Norman Sykes, M.A., D.Phil., Professor of History, London University.

THE complex of problems associated with the subject of religious education in Universities, though having many difficulties in common with the same question in schools, has at least one vitally important difference. University students have embarked upon a course of specialist study, usually vocational in character, and therefore no place is, or can be, accorded in their syllabus of lectures and classes for subjects unconnected with their professional training. I am aware of course that the system of state scholarships and the increasing tendency — a tendency which I welcome in itself — for students to take the Intermediate examinations in Arts and Science, or their equivalents, whilst still at school, are pushing back the age of specialisation into the school career. In some sense therefore this difficulty of specialisation is not peculiar to the universities. But, generally speaking, it may be presumed that throughout the years spent at a primary school and during a great proportion of the time spent at a secondary school, students will attend such religious instruction and services as are provided by the schools as a natural part of their scholastic discipline. At the university this situation is no longer present. Students arrive often ready to embark upon their final course for an honours or pass degree, with neither time nor opportunity for attendance upon courses of instruction in theology. To this extent therefore the question allotted for discussion this evening introduces new elements of difficulty.

Moreover, the question of religious education in an university is beset with other difficulties. It embraces two distinct problems; first that of the function of a theological faculty for the training of candidates for the Christian ministry; and secondly the provision of some kind and degree of religious influence and teaching for students of Arts and Science, who are

not professionally interested in the study of theology. Nor does this exhaust the complexity of issues. It is impossible to speak even of English universities as if they possessed homogeneity of character. Oxford and Cambridge, and to a certain extent Durham, being residential, differ profoundly from the civic universities of London, the Midlands and the North of England, the great majority of whose undergraduates are day students. In the older universities tradition and emoluments have made provision both for theological teaching and religious influence, and the Church of England has a position of importance in this respect. In the newer universities such provision is by no means general, and the position of the Church of England is sadly unimportant. The initial perplexity of the reader of a paper on this subject therefore is to find a starting point, and to endeavour to trace some continuity of argument.

I.

I propose to begin with the question of theological faculties in universities. Obviously they exist primarily for the education of aspirants to the Christian ministry. Secondarily, of course, they should provide opportunity for scholars to make their contribution to Christian theology in whatever branch they have made their subject of special study. This latter objective implies a sufficiency of emolument to free the teacher from extraneous (and financially profitable) work and of leisure to devote to the pursuit of research and writing. The former aim would seem self-evident, if the Church of England did not in practice so largely frustrate it. Upon the question of the desirability, even the necessity, for the majority of the clergy of the Church of England to receive a sound academic training in theology at a theological faculty of an university, there is nothing new or profitable for me to say. In 1935 a paper on *The Training of the Clergy* was read to the annual conference of this society by Chancellor Bezzant. I concur in his analysis of the situation, in his remedies, and there is nothing which I can usefully add to his paper, which it would be tedious to recapitulate. It may be accepted as axiomatic therefore that the Church of England, if

it is to fulfil the aim of its ministry in the present and future, must return to the universities for the theological teaching of its ordinands.

But this means, in practice, the universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Durham, London, and Manchester as far as England is concerned. Only these universities offer both teaching and degrees in theology. Nor should I advocate any widespread attempt in the near future to create theological faculties beyond this number. Ideally of course each university should have a theological faculty. But in the present conditions of financial stringency, it is better to have fewer theological faculties of strong resources in personnel and finance than to multiply faculties weak alike in personnel and finance. In Oxford and Cambridge one thing is needful; a deliberate policy of the authorities of the Church of England to direct theological students to what is already provided. At Durham the present Bishop has long cherished the ambition, and a recent Royal Commission has blessed the project, to create by means of his cathedral chapter a school of theology which would attract ordinands to the Northern Province. I can only state my personal conviction that this is a consummation devoutly to be wished, and speedily to be realized; and to pray for the Bishop the *annos Petri* to see the fulfilment of his desires. For I am convinced that so far as the Northern Province particularly is concerned, a great deal of the future of the Church of England, so far as its theological teaching and the intellectual life of its clergy are concerned, can be fashioned in the castle and cathedral of Durham. Furthermore, the foundations are laid already. In the universities of London and Manchester the foundations are likewise laid; and if a greater number of theological students of the best calibre are sent by the authorities of the Church of England to these universities, I have no doubt of their welcome or of their sound teaching.

The one consideration which, I think, needs to be urged, both in these universities, and elsewhere, as, for example, at Bristol, is that where cathedrals possessing stipendiary canonries exist in proximity to universities, one residentiary canonry should be definitely set aside for a scholar whose duties will embrace theological teaching and religious influence within the

neighbouring university. It is of little profit to bewail the lack of greater opportunities if we do not make the fullest use of those to hand. In the present days, bishops annihilate distance by means of motor-cars; so may cathedral canons in relation to universities in the neighbourhood of their cathedrals. I remember Bishop Brilioth some years ago contrasting the Church of Sweden with that of England, to the great and unflattering disadvantage of the latter, in respect of the paucity in number and poverty in resources of Swedish cathedrals on the one hand compared with the number and comparative wealth of our English cathedrals, and on the other hand the high standard of theological education of the Swedish clergy derived from the faculties associated with the chapters of Lund and Upsala compared with their Anglican brethren. It is a lesson vital to the problem both of the provision of clerical theologians and of the standard of the parochial clergy. Moreover, it is a step which could be taken forthwith to meet the iterated difficulty of raising the standard of clerical education.

If the primary function of a theological faculty of a university is to teach candidates for the Christian ministry, its secondary function will be accepted as the production of learned studies in Christian theology. It follows from this that the majority of such teachers will be 'academic' theologians; than which there can be no greater condemnation to modern ears. For will not their teaching be also academic? And will not ordinands receive from them, not the faith once delivered to the saints, but that now believed probable by the critics? At best will they not be taught an abstract theology, out of relation with the practical problems which their later life as parochial clergy will present to them? This is a difficulty strongly felt and insistently pressed. It must be answered that the preparation for every vocation involves a certain degree of work of an abstract character, such as the scaffolding of facts necessary for the understanding of history, or the linguistic minutiae which lie at the basis of languages and literature, or the dates and authorship of the books of the Bible. More fundamentally, it is my own persuasion that the study of theology at an university should lay the intellectual foundation of the future minister's religious life. Unless the university lays deep and well these intellectual

foundations, it is failing in its objective, and in its duty towards the ordinand. The many years-to-come of his pastoral and parochial ministry will provide abundance of practical circumstances to which the principles of thought learned during academic studies will need to be applied, just as they will supply many things to test and try his faith in God and Man. But unless his faith is founded on a sound intellectual basis, it will be in more, not less, danger of collapse when the storms rage around him. For myself I learned many things as a pupil of Canon Streeter, but none more valuable than the insight which his friendship gave me into a creed adequate to withstand the stresses of life because of its firm intellectual foundation. I find no greater force in the objection that the academic study of theology is unsuitable for parochial clergy than in the contention that ethics should not be taught to youths at an age when their experience of life has not yet supplied them with sufficient intractable human problems for its practical exercise. Most particularly a historical religion, such as Christianity undoubtedly is, cannot evade the duty of facing theological questions of a specifically academic character. The teaching given at the university should be supplemented by pastoral instruction of a practical nature; and whether this kind of work is better done in a rural theological college is a matter upon which opinions may legitimately differ. But of the necessity for a sound intellectual foundation, and of the duty of university theological faculties to provide this, I have no doubt. Even professors are human beings, not immune from those problems of personal religion and practical life which beset mankind. Nor, if their office fails to bring them into intimate connection with the pastoral and administrative organisation of the Church, does the remedy lie in the abolition of an academic theological professoriate but in the integration by the authorities of the Church of their work with the deliberative and administrative organs of its life. The Church of Scotland would appear to find no insuperable difficulties in such a system of training of its ministry; and, if one may judge by results, its parochial ministry does not make shipwreck of the faith nor its academic teachers fail to preach the Gospel from its pulpits.

II.

We may pass therefore to the wider question of the relation and influence of theological faculties to the life of the university as a whole, and especially of its students. Here the difference between old and new universities is of immediate and pressing importance. In Oxford and Cambridge college chapels and their chaplains provide at once the means, material and human, for the religious life of the corporate society. In the non-residential universities no such facilities exist. The greater part of the religious influence exercised there is undoubtedly due to the work of the Student Christian Movement. No teacher in a modern university can doubt or undervalue the enormous task undertaken by the S.C.M. Unfortunately the Church of England has not yet found a way of subsidising this work by regular annual donations. Yet without the influence of the S.C.M., the religious life of the civic universities would be almost non-existent. The conditions of day students, making a journey of from twelve to twenty miles and travelling between an hour and an hour-and-a-half morning and evening, present insuperable difficulties to religious influence. The necessary number of professional lectures, classes, and laboratory work have to be fitted in between the hours of ten and five; with the result that the S.C.M. is to be found making valiant efforts to persuade students to give up part of a restricted luncheon period to attending services or study groups. At the week-end students scatter to their homes, and presumably become the spiritual care of their parish clergy.

Amidst such conditions the difficulties of religious work loom much larger than its opportunities. Yet if it be suggested that this paper concerns itself too little with the older universities, provision is made, as has been observed, both in personnel and buildings for corporate religious life and for a pastoral work to individuals, whereas the reverse is true of the newer; and numerically the undergraduates of the non-residential universities exceed by far those of the older. The new universities provide the largest proportion of the teachers of the country, and the smallest of ordinands; so that any discussion of the question of religious influence in universities which relegates

them to the background is simply vain. In face of such problems it may well seem that the only practical policy is one of despair. But some things can be done, if not all.

First, in universities possessing a theological faculty, an attempt can be made to provide instruction for those who wish to receive it. The attitude of modern universities towards Theology is showing signs of change; and with the increasing realisation of the need for teachers in secondary schools who are both anxious to undertake the teaching of religion and trained to do this efficiently, the inclusion of Divinity, or Theology, as a subject of examination at all stages from the Matriculation, and Higher School Certificate examinations, up to Final Arts is becoming more acceptable. Where universities are willing to allow Theology as an optional subject for Pass or General Arts degrees, the Church should be ready with teachers to meet the situation. By this means a twofold service will be rendered; sound theological teaching will be available in universities, and sound instruction will be disseminated in secondary schools. Needless to say, the provision of such theological teaching in modern universities will require co-operation with other Christian churches, and the theological faculties will be interdenominational. But it is surely the duty of the Church of England to play its full part in such work, and the provision of competent theological teachers cannot be left to chance. In this connection the suggestion previously made concerning the association of cathedrals with universities would be most useful and mutually profitable.

Such facilities for lectures in theological subjects need not be restricted to examination courses. By charter, King's College, London, preserves the first hour of lectures on Monday morning free for a Divinity lecture. Attendance at this is of course entirely voluntary; and no one would pretend that one hour per week during each of three terms is sufficient to declare the whole counsel of God, or the entire range of Christian doc trine, to students inexpert in theological study. But from personal knowledge I can affirm the valuable potentialities of these lectures, and the interest kindled and teaching imparted by such experts, as (to name only persons no longer holding office in that College) Bishop Gore, Canon Barry, and the Dean

of St. Paul's. In Westfield College, London, provision is made by a small endowment for the delivery of two short courses of Divinity lectures during each of the first two terms of the session; and here again I am able to say that, given a good teacher, the results are infinitely worth-while. Such efforts may seem slight; but it is bad policy to neglect what can be done in the hope of some future Utopia of what-may-come-to-pass. At least a beginning can be made in such ways as these; and it is our province, so far as the newer universities are concerned, to make beginnings.

The question of religious services is much more difficult. It involves the provision of a stipend for a suitable chaplain, whose duty will be the baffling one of trying to establish and maintain contacts with day-students, whose hours at their university are already filled to capacity. It embraces also the use of a church; if possible, a church with some pretensions to architectural beauty and historical tradition; for I am sure that it is unwise to under-estimate the effect of nineteenth-century churches as a deterrent from religion. Occasional formal services, such as Graduation Day, or an annual (or even terminal) university Sermon, though welcome as a sign of growing friendliness on the part of universities towards the Church, yet emphasise by their infrequency the paucity of religious influence in academic life. It would be vain indeed to disguise the stubborn fact that comparatively little can be done to help students whose academic day begins and ends with a railway journey of considerable length and time, and whose week-ends are spent away from the university itself.

III.

The question is intractable. But the fact remains that the non-residential universities furnish the greater part of the teachers in our secondary schools, and therefore possess immense potential influence if religion could establish itself effectively within their life. Moreover the number of ordinands among the graduates of modern universities is of very small proportions. Here lies one of the chief problems of the Church of

England. In the older universities, the remedy for any lack of religious influence lies largely in its own hands. In the newer, it has to create opportunties and the agents of their satisfaction. It may be objected however that such suggestions as I have made bold, or timid, to offer are too slight to promise much success. I would reply that the choice, as I see it, is not between even half a loaf, but between a few crumbs and no bread at all. I should desire very cordially to see the Church of England authoritatively and officially throwing the whole of its influence into the movement for restoring the theological teaching of its ordinands to the hands of university theological faculties; and to this end making the fullest possible use of Oxford, Cambridge, Durham, London, and Manchester. This would be a first step; and the French have a proverb of profound truth, *C'est le premier pas qui coûte*. From this there might develope such further steps towards the provision of teaching of the Bible and Christian doctrine to those who are themselves to become teachers in secondary schools as I have tried to suggest as immediately practical. If we could lay even this foundation in the present generation, the future, under God, might see the increase.

Fundamentally however the non-resident university forms a single problem from the religious standpoint with the day-primary and day-secondary school. The university cannot build on no foundation at all; and the key to the solution of its difficulty lies with the school and parish. The great majority of university students who have lived at home throughout their educational career, will either have learned religion at home, in their parish church, and to some slight degree have been taught it in their day-schools, or they will not. Moreover during their university years they will continue to live at home, and therefore their religious life will continue in association with some parish church. If a foundation has been provided, something may be done at the university to broaden its intellectual range and deepen its theological foundations, always provided that the university possesses a theological faculty. For these reasons I am led to the modest conclusions above-stated: namely, that the chief services to be rendered at present by universities to

religion are their training of a competent and learned parochial ministry, their encouragement of scholarly studies of the various aspects of Christian theology by accredited teachers, and the provision of courses in Divinity for those intending teachers in secondary schools who desire to qualify to become teachers of religion. Such a conclusion may well seem too modest; but in view of the existing resources of the Church of England, both in personnel and finance, it may prove beyond its present capacity. Of one thing we may be assured. Unless the Church recognises the primacy of this duty, and resolves to devote to it a fair proportion of its actual resources both of men and money, then the increasing opportunities will be lost. For in my judgment opportunities are increasing. There is a considerable door open and effectual; but there are many obstacles.

THE TEACHING OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

By the Rev. P. Gardner-Smith, B.D., Fellow and Dean of Jesus College, Cambridge.

MY subject is important, for the Old Testament is firmly entrenched in our system of religious education, and the ancient habit of beginning to teach Christianity from the first chapter of *Genesis* still prevails over a large field. It may be defended as being in accordance with tradition. The Christian Church has always valued the revelation of the Old Testament, and from the second century to the twentieth, from the days of Marcion to those of Hitler, there has been no serious attempt to discard the ancient scriptures of the Jews. It would have been strange if it had been otherwise. The first Christians were Jews, and like other Jews, they were the people of a book, though their interest was not focussed on the same parts of the book as absorbed the attention of the Rabbis. Before long the Christians added to the Jewish canon a sacred literature of their own, the scriptures of the New Covenant, but it was only the heretics who were disposed to view the Christian revelation in isolation or to disassociate the Christ of Christian devotion from the work of those ancient seers who, as St. Peter said and as all Christians believed,

> 'prophesied what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow them.'

We may smile at the simplicity of the Fathers in their treatment of the Old Testament, and we are bound to reject many of their interpretations of particular passages, but we must still allow that they were right in affirming the continuity of the Old and New Testament revelations. It is not that the two are bound together in a single dogmatic scheme, such as that conceived by Milton; but rather that the work of our Lord and the rise of the Christian Church were not purely miraculous events in the sense that they bore no relation to past history. In their own way the Fathers saw this, and they expressed by means of a crude con-

ception of prognostication what we express in the terminology of evolution. History is one; the past anticipates the present, and the present is pregnant with the future; therefore there can be no true understanding of the revelation in Christ without some study of the period in which God, by diverse portions and in diverse manners, spake unto the Fathers. If we were to lay aside the Old Testament and begin Christian education with the first chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel we could never hope to reach a true comprehension of the meaning of Christ for ourselves or for the world. The acceptance of the theory of the verbal inspiration of the Jewish scriptures has had many unfortunate consequences in the history of the Christian Church, but the complete rejection of those scriptures would have involved an incalculable loss, and now that we understand them so much better there is certainly no reason why we should relegate them to oblivion. The question then is one which cannot be avoided, What is the right way of using the Old Testament in the work of Christian education? It is a question of urgent importance to all who are engaged in the work of religious instruction among all classes of the community, and one on which scholarship ought to have some guidance to offer.

Most obviously, the teacher must know what it is that he wants to teach, and have in his own mind a clear conception of the true nature and value of the Old Testament scriptures. Ideally that must involve prolonged study, for the nature of a great literature is only apparent to those who have read and reread it, and meditated upon it. Here lies one of our chief difficulties. The Old Testament is a big book, and there are few to-day in any class of society who know it well. Fewer still are acquainted with the results of a century of critical study. Schools, embarrassed as they are by an ever-widening syllabus, have not the time to devote to a thorough study of the Bible, even if they think it worth it, and the result is increasing ignorance. Even young men who come up to the University with the intention of being ordained seldom know more than such chapters of the Old Testament as are appointed to be read in church, while many others know practically nothing. Only three or four years ago an undergraduate bearing a very famous name in my own College asked his supervisor who this Jehovah was whom

he had met in a modern poem. He came from one of our best-known public schools, where presumably the problem of teaching the Old Testament had been solved by not teaching it at all.

The prevailing ignorance has just this to commend it: to-day the keen teacher has a pretty clear field, and he is not embarrassed by the preconceived notions of his pupils or their parents, which used to constitute a considerable problem. In these days a boy or girl who comes to school probably knows very little about the Old Testament, and the teacher has at least an opportunity of forming his ideas on the right lines. To many children the subject is so fresh that if the teacher possesses knowledge and imagination he may succeed in making the Old Testament lesson one of absorbing interest, though the great difficulty remains, that there is so much of it, and time is so short.

What in the light of modern knowledge should be the method of approach? It is axiomatic that the scripture lesson, whether the Old Testament or the New is the subject of study, should be related to the general education of the pupil. It is surely fatal to create an impression that in the scripture class he is dealing with a different world from that with which he is familiar in the study of all other subjects. That has not always been realized. The world of the science class has been a world in which biological evolution and the regularity of causation have been taken as a matter of course; the scripture class has dealt with a world in which creation takes place in six days, and miracles are of daily occurrence. The boy who learns secular history is taught to enquire as to his sources and to estimate their reliability; but when he opens his Bible no such questions are raised, and the record is sometimes treated as true or false according to the preconceived notions of the teacher. Many teachers, not knowing enough about the subject to form an intelligent opinion, avoid the crucial question, take the record as it stands, and leave the pupil to form what conclusion he likes. When such methods have prevailed it is not surprising that the scripture lesson has fallen into contempt. To the intelligent boy it is obvious that it stands on a lower level than his more serious work, and although he may try to memorise facts for the purpose of passing an examination, he never regards them as facts in the same sense as those with which he is elsewhere

familiar. If this is the basis of religion it can hardly appeal to a man of intellectual integrity.

There is no excuse for this kind of scripture teaching at the present day. A few years ago, when we were passing through a period of transition, the teacher of the Old Testament might be forgiven if he exercised a certain amount of reserve, and hesitated to commit himself to views which were still hotly contested. But to-day, when scholars have reached so large a measure of agreement in the Old Testament field, it is surely the duty of anyone who undertakes the work of teaching at all to acquaint himself with the facts and to teach them boldly to the best of his ability. This should not be impossible. Books by competent scholars pour from the Press, and no one who takes the least trouble to obtain and read a few of them need be ignorant of the main conclusions of the scholar. What is more, he will gain an insight into the spirit and method of modern Scriptural study. Many do so, and there are schools in which the scripture teaching is both enlightened and thorough, at least within the limits set by the timetable. But there are others in which the teaching of Scripture is committed to any member of the staff who is willing to do it, or who does not like to refuse, without any enquiry as to his competence. If he is a conscientious man he may study the subject he is required to teach, and he himself will profit hardly less than his pupils; but schoolmasters are busy men and not all of them are conscientious, and it is to be feared that in some cases the quality of the teaching of this most important subject is such as would not be tolerated in any other field. How many headmasters and headmistresses in making appointments to their staff enquire as to the candidate's competence to teach scripture? I have been told that it is actually a disadvantage for a Cambridge woman graduate who wishes to teach in a girls' school to have taken honours in theology; many headmistresses fear that she may cause trouble with the parents, who prefer teaching which is traditional to that which is true. In boys' schools complete indifference is commoner; if a master is willing to take the scripture class and prepare the boys for examinations his services are gratefully accepted, whether he is competent or not.

This Union should press its demand for better training of

teachers and hence better Scripture teaching, but with that demand must go another for complete freedom of the teacher to give expression to his own convictions. We must rely on headmasters not to give this work into the hands of masters who are completely unsympathetic.

Let us try to see rather more clearly what is required. In the first place, the evolutionary view of religion is fundamental to any modern presentation of the Old Testament. The Old Testament is a unique and marvellous collection of ancient literature, but it is not all of the same value and it contains some very unpleasant things. As the Emperor Julian remarked long ago,

> 'The most ruthless of Roman generals never did anything so barbarous as the slaughter of the Canaanites, which Jehovah is said to have enjoined.'

It does not need a Marcion to observe the contrast between the morality of the Old Testament and that of the New. To us it is a truism that the whole book is sub-Christian, else there would have been no need for it to have been superseded by a later revelation. But looking back at the history of the Christian Church, we must admit that this fact has often been imperfectly grasped. The idea of verbal inspiration has led to the whole Bible being put on one level, and many abominations, from the burning of witches to the ruthless castigation of children, have been justified by quotation from the Old Testament. The old view is not dead yet, except in a strictly limited circle. Not many years ago one of my parishioners said to me, 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, that's in the Bible, isn't it?' There are still great numbers of people in this country who suppose that for a Christian the Old and New Testaments are equally authoritative. The evolutionary view of religion has not yet gripped the popular imagination.

Here then is one of the modern teacher's first tasks, to make sure that no pupil of his shall ever fail to understand that the Old Testament, with all its grandeur, represents an early and imperfect stage of man's age-long search for God, and that its revelation was superseded by the revelation of God in Christ. Once this fact has been grasped, the teacher's task becomes not only more interesting but much easier. There is no longer the need to justify to puzzled and sceptical pupils that which cannot

be justified by later and higher standards. There is no longer the necessity of straining the faith of the learner in the effort to believe that which he knows in his heart is not true. There is no longer the gulf between what the pupil learns in the scripture lesson and what he learns when he is studying ancient history or modern science. Scripture falls into place, and the learner gradually gains some appreciation of the true greatness of the Old Testament by comparing and contrasting its books with other remains of ancient literature. A writer of one of Messrs. Watts's publications stated lately that there is nothing in the books of the Old Testament to raise them above the level of other books when once they have been correctly dated. An intelligent boy who has studied the Old Testament from the modern point of view is not likely to take seriously a statement of that kind.

But let us be more precise. Granted that it is desired to teach the Old Testament in the light of modern theories of evolution, how is the teacher to set about his task? If he is dealing with young children there is only one thing he can do, and that is to tell them the stories beloved of so many generations of Jewish and Christian children. They should be selected stories, no doubt; but I doubt whether the teacher of very young children need worry much about their moral and religious propriety. Children have a way of reacting healthily to a story, if no attempt is made to force sophisticated judgments upon them. The other day an infant told a Sunday-school teacher of my acquaintance that Balaam was a bad man, and when asked to justify this rather unexpected verdict he replied that he was a bad man because he beat his donkey. It is well worth teaching the story of Balaam's ass to elicit such a very sound pronouncement. Of course the skilled teacher will often give the children a lead, and the way in which a story is told counts for much; but in the early stages the stories are worth telling for their own sake, if only because they create the early impression that the Bible is an interesting book.

The difficulty admittedly begins in the next stage. To a young child a story is a story, and that is the end of the matter; but in a few years questionings arise as the child begins to co-ordinate his experiences, and then he wants to know what really

happened. The child is a natural dogmatist, and for a time is quite willing to be assured that everything in the Bible is true. The teacher who so assures him will save himself a great deal of trouble for the time being, but he will expose the child to a shattering experience in a few years when he discovers that he has been taught in the name of religion what is not true. The only honest method at this stage is to lead the child gently and gradually to appreciate the difference between mere historical accuracy and spiritual truth. It is not so hard as it sounds. I well remember my own experiences with a class of little girls, about eleven years old. Our subject was the early chapters of *Genesis*, and I did my best to shew them that much is to be learned from these stories even if they are not records of historical events. They were shocked at first, and so were their parents, who sent me messages of rebuke. But they saw the point in the end, and became really interested in the new point of view. They were only Cambridge Sunday School children, and their studies could not proceed very far; but it is easy to see how much might be done with children rather older and of better general education. Once it is grasped that the Old Testament is something more than a rather doubtful history book, the way is opened for the study of matters more obviously connected with religion.

For instance, to return to the conception of religious evolution, it is possible to co-ordinate religious instruction with all that young people learn in these days about the history of the human race and the slow development of civilization. If the Old Testament is presented to them as it stands they will soon set it aside as a book unworthy of serious attention; but if they are taught to see in it the history of man's search for God, and of God's gradual revelation of Himself, they will find it a book of unique interest and importance, second only to the New Testament for the inspiration it provides in the circumstances of the present day.

It is strange that many earnest Christian people still shrink from a treatment of the Bible which so greatly increases its usefulness and which alone accords with a worthy conception of the nature of God. Unless the evolutionary view is accepted it is impossible to relate biblical religion to its historical environ-

ment. A thousand years before Christ man, even civilized man, was a simple being. For history he was content with myth, and his theology was a vague belief in more or less unrelated spiritual powers. His ethics seldom went beyond a regard for inherited tradition, and his untutored mind allowed him to suppose that anything might happen at the behest of arbitrary supernatural beings. In such an environment it is absurd to expect a pure and spiritual belief in God, and in so far as later writers have represented the early heroes of their race as monotheists we may be sure that they have read back into the past the conditions of their own age. More truly historical are those half savage elements which have escaped the careful editing of later hands, and more important are the first dawnings of a purer faith which give to the ancient books of Israel a religious significance unique in the literature of the ancient world.

I cannot think that it is impossible to make intelligent boys and girls understand this. As they read the Old Testament literature they encounter elements typical of the various ages to which it belongs. In the early parts they read of savage rites, incredible miracles, and a view of the nature and working of God hardly tolerable in the modern nursery. But all these they soon learn to regard as reflecting the mentality of a distant age, and they realize that there is much else. They can easily be led to see that the real miracle of biblical history lies in the fact that Israel outgrew these things, and while other nations were left, on the decay of their early faiths, with a barren scepticism or an undisciplined superstition, the Hebrew people attained to a religion fit to be at least the foundation of the faith of Jesus Christ, and hence of the religion of the modern world. No teacher of imagination, no boy of active intelligence, can fail to see here a subject of compelling interest, and the problem of how it all happened provides a historical study which is religious in the highest sense of the term.

In this connexion the work of the Prophets demands special attention. There is no need to insist here that what is unique in the religion of the Hebrews is not the possession of a sacrificial system, of a picturesque folk-lore, or even of a code of law suited to the conditions of the time in which it was composed. All these things can be paralleled among other nations whom we

do not regard as the recipients of any special revelation. But no other nation produces leaders and teachers to be compared for a moment with the prophets of Israel, to whose influence must be ascribed the growth of Israel's religion into an ethical and spiritual faith. Here we escape from a purely naturalistic view of the Bible. The direct inspiration of the Spirit of God is to be sought, not in the work of the writers of *Genesis* or the *Books of Kings*, but in the message of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Jeremiah.

Whatever else then is taught, the work of the prophets must be given first place in the work of senior schools and universities. The earlier books must be regarded as leading up to the prophets; the historical books are chiefly interesting as providing the setting for the prophets' work; the later books shew the effect of the prophets' teaching upon a people not always responsive, but unable to escape the influence of men in whom the Spirit of God dwelt.

There are practical difficulties, no doubt. The real greatness of the prophets does not appear from a casual reading of the somewhat confused and confusing records of their utterances. Not a few passages in the prophetic books perplex even the specialist, and no adequate understanding of the greatness of the prophets is possible without a considerable study of the historical background of their utterances. It is much harder to take a class in Jeremiah than in Joshua, and the teacher who is to interest and edify his class will have to put in a good deal of time at private study unless he has a much wider knowledge of the Old Testament than most lay schoolmasters possess. But such labour is abundantly worth while. Other subjects are not taught without previous study, and in these days of popular but reliable theological works and of inexpensive but scholarly commentaries the difficulty of understanding the prophets has been greatly reduced. Perhaps the chief danger that a teacher has to face is that of missing the wood for the trees. So many points of history and criticism arise that it is not always easy to keep the great matters in the forefront. But the problem is not insoluble, and the ability of a teacher may be measured largely by his success in finding a solution. The great achievements of the prophets stand out unmistakably when their writings are put into the true historical context. Most young people are im-

pressed by the Second Isaiah's conception of the one God who sitteth upon the circle of the earth and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers, who stretcheth out the heavens like a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in, who weighs the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance. If a teacher can find no lessons in worship in the sixth chapter of Isaiah, then he is evidently the wrong man to take the subject. Boys and girls in the senior classes are just at the age at which they are interested in the ethical implications of religion, and the prophetic conception of God who demands obedience before sacrifice and whose holiness is essentially moral, not physical, is likely to make a strong appeal. I can only say that I still remember how thrilled I felt when I first realized who the prophets were and what they achieved; but that was at the University and my teacher was Professor Kennett; I do not remember that I learned anything about the prophets when I was at school.

I think perhaps I ought not to stop without saying a word on the subject which is in all your minds and which has cropped up several times in our previous discussions. What has all this to do with the present urgent religious situation?

Those who cannot see further than their noses will answer 'Nothing.' People, young people in particular, want to know whether the Church can help in the solution of modern ethical, social, and political problems, whether religion can reduce the chances of war, and the clergy give effective help in promoting the growth of a just, peaceful and efficient social system. At first sight the study of the reign of David and even the life of the prophet Jeremiah seem extraordinarily remote. The lovers of short cuts are not interested.

Yet I believe they are wrong. We do not claim that modern problems will be solved by the study of the Old Testament, but we do claim that they will be solved by the influence of Christianity inspired by the living Spirit of God. But what is Christianity? Does it consist of a few admirable maxims which men will apply when it suits them? Or is it a Gospel based on a view of the nature of the world and of the purpose of its Maker all-embracing in scope and compelling in its necessary conse-

quences? Can we doubt which is the truer view? But if Christianity is essentially a Gospel it must have a broad and deep intellectual foundation, and we cannot afford to neglect any field of study that leads to the better understanding of its history, its nature, and its final and inevitable consequences. We must read the Old Testament to understand the New.

I hope I shall not be thought to have passed too lightly over the great difficulties involved. I know something of the problems which confront the conscientious schoolmaster who wishes to make the most of the brief hour or so allowed for Scripture teaching in the time-table of the average school. But I believe that it is not really harder in the end to teach a subject well than to teach it badly, and once the great opportunity of the Old Testament lesson has been grasped it is worth while to take advantage of the treasures of modern study and research. If the Old Testament is to be taught in the spirit of a hundred years ago it would perhaps be better that it should not be taught at all; but if it can be taught as the unique record of the growth of man's religious consciousness from the childish conceptions of early days to the inspired visions of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the nameless prophet of Bablylon, then indeed it may provide the solid and indispensable foundation for the study of the final revelation which has come through Him whom we, with all Christian people, revere as the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

THE EDUCATIONAL USE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

By Professor C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D., Mansfield College, Oxford.

WHEN we combine the adjective 'Christian' with the noun 'Education,' we are coining a phrase behind which lie certain great presuppositions. We presuppose the acceptance of the Christian religion as true, the understanding of its nature and content, and the relevance of education to the task of propagating and fostering it.

If then we are to consider with any profit the problems of Christian education, some preliminary study of these presuppositions is necessary. I propose therefore at the outset to put before you in brief outline what I understand them to mean, and in what sense I shall be making use of them in dealing with the special question that has been allotted to me.

I define Christianity, in its intensive or personal aspect, as man's whole-hearted acceptance of the loving rule of God on the strength of the impact made by Jesus on his receptive spirit, his whole-hearted willingness to allow his implicit or tentative belief in the sovereignty and goodness of God to be made by Jesus conscious, explicit, and fruitful. The roots of the Christian profession, therefore, lie deep down in the human will — that central, yet imperfectly analysed, region of our being. 'Quicunque vult' — that phrase takes us straight to the differentia which characterizes the Christian in its distinction from the non-Christian attitude. What is it which at bottom accounts for one man taking this attitude, and for another man not taking it, it is beyond our power to state with any completeness or precision. We realize that environment must have a lot to do with it; and yet we do not believe that it can be the work of environment alone. The solution suggested in the theologies of Augustine and Calvin, namely, that the difference goes back to an inscrutable (and to us apparently arbitrary) selective decree of God, who simply chooses to bestow His salvation on some, and to leave others without it, raises far more

difficulties than it removes, and must therefore be quite definitely rejected — and rejected, I would say, with sufficient finality to prevent its being subsequently reintroduced in some backstairs or indirect manner. We are thus shut up to the necessity of saying: a man's religious position is at bottom the result of an act of his will — and we have to leave it at that.

But our inevitable vagueness regarding the really ultimate roots of a man's religious attitude need not diminish our interest in, or our attention to, the conditions of its healthy growth, any more than the mystery that lies at the basis of all things is an excuse for inefficiency in the practical affairs of life. It is when we go on to study what develops from the root that we realize the rich complexity of the Christian life and the intimate concern of education with it.

The acceptance of the loving rule of God is seen at once to involve three great concerns, which I would designate very roughly as worship, conduct, and thought.

(1) By worship I mean communion with God, the cultivation of personal relations between ourselves and One Who is known through Jesus as Father, and Who as Father must needs prize supremely the loving fellowship of man with Himself.

(2) By conduct I mean the whole exercise of the human will, particularly as affecting the relations between ourselves and our fellow-men.

(3) By thought I mean the effort to understand with increasing completeness the nature of things as they are, in particular to grasp the truth regarding the character and will and ways of God.

These three concerns perpetually interact on one another. Thus, worship is affected both by the sense of duty with which it is practised, and by the beliefs concerning God which we entertain while practising it. In its turn it makes right conduct and clear thinking easier. Similarly, conduct and thought affect one another: thought itself is obedience to that law enjoining a love for truth which is one of the rules of right conduct, while right conduct in its turn largely depends on accurate beliefs concerning God and ourselves. But while these three are thus interdependent, the distinction between them is valid; and, provided we remember that the thought of the individual both

affects, and is affected by, his devotional and his practical life, we can now proceed with that consideration of Christian thought as such, to which the phrase 'Christian Education' clearly refers.

The object of Christian Education I take to be the impartation to the person being educated of the fullest and most relevant knowledge concerning the ways and the will of God in regard to men. What I have just said about the mutual interaction of thought, worship, and conduct, will, I trust, save me from being accused of identifying education with the mere accumulation of facts. Education in the wide sense has to do with the whole of man's many-sided personality: yet clearly its primary concern is with the intelligence; and the main business of the intelligence is ability to acquire relevant knowledge, not of isolated facts only, but of their inter-relation and true significance.

It is not easy to describe, or mark out the limits and divisions of, that vast area of reality which is the proper field of Christian education in the strict sense. There is, indeed, no section of reality that necessarily lies altogether outside this field. Yet obviously, for practical purposes, we need to select and isolate the more from the less important parts of it: and that task has — so far as this paper is concerned — been already done for me, for I am to deal with the educational use of the *New Testament*. I shall thus be engaged on what is really the central and most essential, though not the only important, item in Christian education: for obviously, whatever sections of the field might be relegated to the regions about its circumference as by comparison the less essential, the New Testament could never be so relegated. Christianity being an historical religion, the history of its foundation and rise forms the central item in that range of topics in which the Christian man needs to be educated. The heart having been given to God, the duty is accepted of learning as much of His character and purpose as is enshrined for us in the story of the earthly life of His Son, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and in the story of those who first proclaimed His Gospel to men.

The presentation of the personality of Jesus Christ thus becomes the topic of central interest in any scheme of Christian education worth the name. And inasmuch as He, while sharing

our full humanity, stands apart from us all as the author of our trust in God, we must be prepared to find that the educational study of His personality is a task attended by certain special and unique conditions and therefore by certain peculiar difficulties also.

For our concern with Him is not limited to an endeavour to ascertain historical facts about Him, vitally important as that endeavour is: our concern is affected by our realization that He has a place in our devotional life, that His character, example, and teaching have normative value for our own living, and that even our thoughts about Him must take account of what previous generations of Christians have declared to be the true significance of His person. The Christian teacher cannot afford to ignore either the evangelical experience of mystical union with the living Christ, or the position accorded to Him as the Son of God in the Creeds of Christendom, or the ethical idealism which sees the only right way of life in close obedience to His teaching and example. But I would submit to you that, while it would for these reasons be a mistake to treat Jesus Christ as nothing more than an historical figure, the best possible knowledge of the historical figure is a help and not a hindrance to a true evaluation of our Saviour's person as an object of devotional love or as a model for ethical obedience or as a theme for theological confession and speculation. Nay, I will go further, and say that the best possible historical knowledge is an essential pre-requisite for any healthy Christ-mysticism, any sound Christian ethic, or any sane theology. I am even disposed to contend that, for lack of adequate attention to what the historical evidence can give us (whether that lack of attention be regarded as at any period excusable or not) Christian devotion, Christian ethics, and Christian theology have in the past all grievously suffered.

I propose to drop from this point onwards the consideration of what I have referred to as mystical union with Christ, not because I judge it to be unreal or unimportant, but because its actual relationship with historical facts is less close and direct than that of ethics and doctrine, and because it is a type of religious devotion for the first-hand enjoyment of which not all Christian disciples find themselves possessed of the requisite

capacity. Its exact character and the precise conditions favouring it are very imperfectly known. Beyond urging therefore that such a religious experience necessarily stands to gain rather than to lose from an improved knowledge of Jesus' life on earth, I propose to leave it aside from our discussion of the educational use of the Gospels.

In the two other fields, however — those, namely, of ethics and of doctrine, the educational use of the story of the historical Jesus is of fundamental importance.

(1) *Ethics*. The first and most obvious ethical implicate of discipleship was felt to be the duty of obeying the Master's teaching and copying His example. 'Why do ye call me "Lord, Lord," and do not do the things I tell you?' (*Lk.* vi, 46). 'I have given you an example, that — as I have acted towards you — ye in your turn should act towards each other' (*John* xiii, 15). '. . . leaving you an example, that ye should follow in his footprints' (I *Peter* ii, 21). It seemed natural to try to imitate the Master's life exactly, to obey His teaching closely, and of course to treat all His sayings as finally accurate pronouncements. But men came eventually to see that this literalism was not the truest type of discipleship. Modifications and interpretations of various kinds had to be made, and certain special conditions incidental to our Lord's life on earth and to His peculiar personal office had to be allowed for: and the principle of literal obedience did not furnish sufficiently clear guidance as to how this was to be done. The Pauline warning against knowing Christ after the flesh was meanwhile at work all the time, with the result that, in certain circles, a position of comparative unconcern regarding the historical realities of His life and doings and moral character was taken up. Jesus of Nazareth was declared (or at any rate tacitly assumed) to be of little import as compared with the Christ of faith. The high-water-mark reached by this tendency is to be found, I believe, in some words written by Dr. Emil Brunner, which I can never read or repeat without a spiritual shudder. 'The biography of Jesus of Nazareth,' he writes, '— this latest product of an ill-informed theology — would have been just as repulsive to the early Christians as a mummified corpse is repulsive to us. Jesus of Nazareth, the rabbi, the so-called historical Jesus, was an object of no interest

for the early Christians and is of no interest to-day for those who have preserved some understanding of what Christian faith means. What interests the Church and the believer is Jesus *Christ*—the Jesus in whom God speaks to us His Word. The "historical Jesus" is a corpse, a scientific abstraction which is of no value to us. It was not the deeds, the life, the teaching of the rabbi Jesus, that Mark or Luke wanted to hand down to posterity; like the author of the Fourth Gospel they wanted to tell the deeds and the Word of God in Jesus Christ' (*The Word and the World*, pp. 87 f.). Such an attitude represents a pendulum-swing to the extreme opposite of an undiscriminating Tolstoyism. That the reaction is as dangerous as that against which it protests becomes clear when we take note of the extreme Barthian attitude to certain great ethical problems like those of war or social injustice. The contemptuous disregard of these urgent questions on the part of leading Barthians—a disregard defended by fear of an unevangelical legalism—is very hard to justify according to the ethical standards demanded in the teaching of the Gospels, or even to reconcile with the Barthian insistence on the historical reality and importance of the Incarnation.

A middle course between the Barthian and the Tolstoyan extremes is needed. We must endeavour to grasp as clearly as we can what it was that Jesus did and taught; and in doing this we must be prepared to find that He was more directly concerned with certain special questions of His race and time than perhaps we had imagined. But the more we succeed, by the help of exact critical study, in seeing the real meaning and quality of His life, the more clearly shall we be able to understand the import of His ethical convictions and utterances, and so to discover the eternal truths they enshrine and to apply them rightly to the problems and tasks of our own lives to-day.

(2) *Doctrine*. In the field of doctrine, the critical study and exposition of the Gospel-story should administer a much-needed corrective to the age-long tendency to subordinate morals to metaphysics in the interpretation of Divine realities. At an early point in the history of the Church, Christians began to lay stress on the acceptance of a certain philosophical or metaphysical version of Christ's person rather than on the moral quality

of His life, as the key to a vital understanding of the Incarnation. Without denying that the purely metaphysical interest was, up to a point, justified, we cannot doubt that the virtually exclusive concentration on it had a very evil effect, not only on the character, but also on the theology, of the members of the Christian Church. The more men regarded credal orthodoxy on metaphysical issues as the one thing that really mattered, the less important did they think Christlikeness in spirit and character to be, and the more unsatisfactory in consequence did the Church's Christological doctrine become. She became so busy insisting on and safeguarding his *metaphysical* divinity, that she had little time or energy left to take practical or theoretical note of His *moral* divinity. The reductio ad absurdum of this process is seen in the diabolical cruelties practised by orthodox Christians of the sixteenth century without any sense whatever of disloyalty to any Christian standard that really concerned them. The doctrinal result of this comparative neglect of Jesus' human life and character was the erection as orthodox and binding of a Christological theory which, by denying that His personality was human, virtually contradicts several of the clearest pieces of historical evidence, and deprives the Gospel-picture of a great part of its reality and of its regenerating power. By going back to this Gospel-story in a spirit of greater faithfulness to historical truth, we shall be in less danger of getting entangled in the subtleties and abstractions which have attended the traditional attempts to define the Person of Christ with a precision which — as Hilary in a famous passage frankly confessed — is beyond the power of limited human minds.

What I have said regarding the portraits of Jesus in the Gospels holds good, mutatis mutandis, for the remainder of the New Testament. While the terms in which the first generations of Christians expressed their devotion towards and their theories regarding the Author and Perfecter of their faith were necessarily conditioned by the thought-habits of the time, and therefore cannot serve us as final or fully-satisfying vehicles for our own thoughts, yet those terms and the whole story and literature which forms their setting are full of value to us as throwing much light, if only indirectly, on the character and aim and achievements of Jesus himself, and also as enshrining for our edification

and blessing a very real revelation of the purpose and will of God. This is an important and even a vital point, though there is no need, or indeed, opportunity to labour it further here. Suffice it to say that the study of the life and thought of the first Christian century must be carried on with the same loyalty to historical evidence as is requisite in the study of the Gospel-story.

It is not, of course, my business in this paper to sketch, even in the briefest outline, the historical picture of Jesus and the early Church, as it would emerge from a really thorough and competent investigation of the data. But I may perhaps be allowed to urge that there is nothing to prevent the non-technical teacher or preacher availing himself to the full of the findings of scientific study in regard to the original text of the New Testament, its real meaning in translation, its historical and doctrinal import, and the grounds on which these several findings are based. He must not be deterred by the probability that this process of investigation will involve him in the pain incidental to all change in our religious beliefs. In so far as his educational work has to be done by preaching to a normal congregation from the pulpit of his church, he must, of course, make sure that his flock will be edified by what he says to them. It is no part of true education to thrust before imperfectly-educated folk negative conclusions which they are quite incapable of either weighing or appreciating. The Christian preacher is therefore justified, not indeed in denying the truth, but in passing by certain truths unuttered, in circumstances in which the open declaration of them cannot edify, but is bound simply to perplex. Yet it is just in view of such circumstances as these that a more definitely educational method has its value. If not in the pulpit, then in the Teachers' Training-Class, or the Young People's Bible-Class, or perhaps the Week-Evening Service, one can train the minds of those who are willing to be trained, in the historical method and its main achievements. The effect of such training, if properly administered, will be far from negative. It will lead to a clearer realization of the true basis of religious authority in the immediate contact between God and ourselves in conscience and intellect, without losing the immense value of the historical revelation of God in the Person of

Christ and the story of the Church. It should moreover lead to a great enrichment of personal religion through a truer understanding of the ways of God with men.

A good instance of how modern criticism may enlighten the minds of Christians who are not technical theologians is the fresh interpretation of the Book of Jonah, if I may be allowed for the moment to draw an illustration from the Old Testament. Instead of cudgelling our brains and getting impatient with one another over the miracle of the fish, and making of it a type of our Lord's burial, as is done in *Matth.* xii, 40, how much more helpful is it to bring out the purpose for which the tale was originally told, *i.e.* not to record actual facts of history, but to set forth to a community of exclusive Jews the loving concern of God for Gentiles as well as Jews, and even for beasts as well as men, and then to go on to show that Jesus chose Jonah, not Amos or Isaiah, as a sign of Himself, because he was the one and only prophet who was sent with a saving message to *Gentiles*.

This instance leads me to say something about the parabolic method of teaching. Despite the large number of good recent books on the Gospel-parables, we are still somewhat in the dark as to the real meaning of some at least of them. Moreover, we must always bear in mind that Jesus' purpose in using parables was not quite the same as that of the modern educator endeavouring to interest and instruct a group of juniors. Jesus' parables were mostly weapons of controversy, inducing his opponents to commit themselves unawares to judgments and concessions they would never have made with their eyes open. They were not to any considerable extent allegories. Yet the illustrative stories used by the modern teacher of the young do bear some resemblance to the Gospel-parables. Both alike trade on the abiding tendency of human beings to take an interest in a breezy narrative. Both aim at conveying spiritual truth indirectly; and both can be utilized in the service of Christian education. And while a modern teacher will never be able to produce parables in the inimitable way in which our Lord produced them, he ought to copy our Lord's example so far as to study and use all the best available methods of teaching by means of acceptable and interesting illustrations.

In the opening pages of Dr. C. H. Dodd's suggestive book, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, a sharp distinction is drawn between early Christian preaching and early Christian teaching. The distinction is a real one — up to a point. Preaching is proclaiming or announcing; teaching is explaining and educating. Yet it must be remembered that the distinction concerns more the form than the substance of what is done. If that which is preached is to be *intelligently* received, it clearly needs to be expounded under criticism and questioning; its grounds must be made clear; its implications for thought and life pointed out; and its relevance and value set forth — and all that means teaching. The spirit of the early Church was thus educative as well as missionary: thus we have the educative Gospels of Luke and 'Matthew,' as well as the kerygmatic Gospels of Mark and 'John.' Paul was before everything else a Christian missionary: yet his Epistles show how much time and energy he had to spend in teaching his converts what their conversion involved. The less argumentative and more kerygmatic parts of the New Testament will always have their devotional and missionary value: but we shall never be able to dispense with the explanatory and didactic portions. Just as there was need for both in the first century, so there is need for both in the twentieth. The need for convincing and enlightening the minds of men, as well as for moving their hearts, appears in post-New-Testament times still more clearly than in the first century—in the task taken up by the Apologists, and in the splendid record of the Alexandrian school of Christian thinkers. And even if we to-day cannot take over all the actual teachings of these great predecessors of ours, we can at least realize as clearly as they did that man's intellect as well as his heart belongs to God, and that, if the Christian Church cannot satisfy the reasonable demands of the minds of thinking men, she is failing in a very essential part of her God-given task. We can copy the example of our predecessors in calling for the consecration of keen brains to the service of Christ, and in taking very seriously His own addition to the Deuteronomic Law when He bade us love God *with all our mind*.

It must, I think, be admitted that the whole-hearted acceptance of the educational method as a legitimate means of Chris-

tian propaganda and nurture is not without its peculiar difficulties and dangers. Many, we know, will have nothing to do with it on the ground that it necessitates an abandonment of so many of the old simplicities and assurances. It seems to involve so much criticizing, so much upsetting of previous views, so much uncertainty, so much of that vague terror — subjectivism. Philosophically, it requires us to face at least the abstract possibility that a love for Truth at all costs and a loyalty to God through Christ may lead the mind in two divergent directions. Yet a candid survey of the situation should suffice to convince us that, whatever the difficulties and risks, we have no real option in the matter. It is emphatically a case of 'Hobson's Choice.' We all want a religion in which we can rest: and how is it possible to rest in a religion that is afraid to face up to the demands of the truth-loving intellect? To shun education in the interests of religious settlement and confidence is therefore to dig one's spiritual grave. Better far to take our courage in both hands, and go ahead, believing that the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ has rightly been called 'the God of Truth,' and that in following Truth we inevitably follow Him.

THE EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF PUBLIC DIVINE WORSHIP

By the Rev. Canon R. D. Richardson, M.A., B.Litt.

A UNIVERSITY professor in one of the sciences, who was not remarkable for his allegiance to institutional Christianity, told me that recently his regard for it had been greatly quickened by a visit to some of the temples of India. An organized religion is indeed judged by its primary activity, its Public Worship; for this is the rallying-point which reflects unmistakably its capacity to unveil the character of God and the nature of the good life. A noble Public Worship, said the late Percy Dearmer, will 'worthily shew forth both the glory of God, high above our human disputations, and the personal devotion, the reasonable faith, the corporate usefulness of those who try to worship Him in spirit and truth, and to serve him here below.'[1]

Not far removed from these are the terms in which Plato defines the object of education. No education is satisfactory, he maintains (to use the words of J. S. Hoyland), 'which does not bring the pupil to the point at which he may see the vision of Eternal Reality, and learn to think rightly about God, about the relationships between man and God, about the vast enterprises of carrying out the Will of God in the creation of God-likeness amongst men, about all the complex readjustments that the creation of such God-likeness will make needful in the relationship between man and man in an ideally-organized community.'[2]

These then are the values — the educational values — to be fostered by Public Divine Worship; and not only the substance but the manner of that worship reveals whether they are present.

II. There are three main types of Public Worship; one whose focus is a sacrificial cultus, a second whose object is primarily edification, and a third which combines both of these. The first

[1] *Our National Church*, p. 92.

[2] *The Great Forerunner*, pp. 132 ff.

is universal and age-long; it belongs to man as man. It has its origin in primeval group-activities answering to the *Mysterium Tremendum* behind phenomena; hence the cosmic sense which pervades it through its developing forms; hence the social nature which invests it. Generally speaking, and without reference to points of scholarly dispute, propitiation is its crowning object; sacrifice its unvarying method; a priesthood its appointed agency; ritual acts, a communal meal, and later a vivid mythology are its subjective satisfactions.

The second type of worship has an aspect of solitariness. Offered by a number of people together, it is nevertheless essentially the fruit of private wrestling with God. Its nature is seen best in the great geniuses of religion; in the supreme Greek mythical figure of Prometheus chained to his rock, the historical Mohamed brooding in the desert, the Buddha in his intense meditation beneath the Bo-tree. The Son of Man in the wilderness and upon the Cross is solitary too.[3] But this element makes its appearance *within* the cultus, which thus becomes transformed, although only by modifications. There are moods in which men like the eighth century Jewish Prophets would have abolished the cultus altogether. 'I hate, I despise your feasts . . . . Take away from me the noise of thy songs, I will not hear the melody of thy viols'; 'When ye come to appear before Me, who hath required this at your hand, to trample My courts?'; 'Wash you, make you clean, . . . cease to do evil, learn to do good'; all these are cries with a note of intransigeant iconoclasm. Those who uttered them wished for nothing more than that 'ritual pure and undefiled,' extolled by the Epistle of James, which identifies public worship with public morality. But a cultus is part of man's response to the Divine, so natural that it is also necessary, and indeed, in one form or another, inevitable. Without it the sense of God would evaporate, in the commonalty of men. And the prophetic type of religion, with its intellectualizations and its moralizations was compelled, rightly as well as inevitably, to domesticate itself within the priestly. Yet the two were never rightly fused until the advent of Christianity. Indeed, they are not perfectly fused yet, either in thought or in worship. The problem of worship still — and

[3] *cf.* A. N. Whitehead, *Religion in the Making*, p. 9.

with it is bound up the future of civilization — is how to unite the cosmic-priestly view with the personal-prophetic; more, how to plant the second right in the heart of the first.

The third type of worship, Christian Public Worship — even in its varied and so far imperfect forms — does embody this attempted ideal. Let us then fix our eyes first on the ideal itself. Brief suggestions for its complete achievement I shall advance later.

At the centre of Christian Public Worship there is Christ. In the priestly type of religion, the worshippers express their prayer most completely in the contemplation of the performance of a holy Mystery, and receive their most powerful impulse to fervent devotion from the sight of a cultual object.[4] The impact of prophetic thought and ethics tends to banish the holy Mystery and the cultual object, and to concentrate the worshippers' attention upon the 'holiness' (both aloofness and righteousness) of an image-less God. A weakening of the primal religious emotions follows; and edification, not oblation, may become the character of the resultant worship. But in Christian Public Worship, since the cultual object is replaced by Christ, the sense of cosmic Deity takes on an aspect which is personal. Worship is still directed to the *Mysterium Tremendum*, but now it is addressed through the revealing Christ. There is no question of displacing God, or even of equating Him with the historic Jesus; but, the heart of the Universe being represented to us satisfactorily by the person and character of Jesus, the age-long mystery of the nature of the Reality behind phenomena is solved for us; and with this is solved also the problem of our right relationship to it. Whatever more than personalistic — if anything — it may be, we can never realize. Reality must for ever be presented to us adequately by the symbol on which Professor Bethune-Baker used so richly to insist, namely, God-and-Man. And now, the being of God and the being of man being understood to be indissolubly related to each other, Revelation is realized to be nothing more or less than the communication to us, by God, of His own Self; so that the purpose of Public Worship, its *raison d'être*, besides being the adoration of the Eternal Spirit, our Fount and Origin, is also to appropriate the Revela-

[4] *cf.* F. Heiler, *Prayer*, p. 345.

tion and become ourselves full persons; rich personalities, creative, with breadth of interest and fullness of energy directed to spiritual ends; who can unite and constitute a living society. On its human side, then, Christian Public Worship has for its purpose that which is also the purpose of education; and the visible Church with its cultus-apparatus is the organ for bringing this about.

III. Let us now consider in some detail three reasons for believing that Public Worship is a necessary part of education and that it is in keeping with the methods and general outlook of educationalists.

(1) The first reason is psychological. The value-priority of mind over body is indisputable (whatever view of the origin of mind be taken), but we are minds integrally related to bodies, endowed with action and sensation; and these provide us with so many opportunities of informing and expressing ourselves. The Church's broad ritual and sacramental system is thus educationally vindicated. Public Worship *is* practical psychology. Its use of expressive words and symbols, like yet unlike those which waken all our mental life, stirs within us the sense of the Unseen. Likewise do actions that might be so insignificant: the bending of the knees, the clasping of hands, the bowing of heads and closing of eyes, now done in prayer; the singing of hymns, the turning to the East, the concentration on a visible or visualizable image; particularly when these are done in unison. They present vividly to the worshipper's senses, says J. B. Pratt, an object intimately connected with his faith, in such fashion that the object of his faith shall have almost the immediacy and concreteness and tangibility of material things.'[5] Conversely, these ritual acts reflect ideally the motor tendencies in which religious feelings and beliefs, like all other mental concepts, must work themselves out; and, by repetition, they strengthen the feelings themselves. So—this is Evelyn Underhill's way of putting it—'the stuff of our sensory experience becomes the stuff of our spiritual experience too.'

The fact that the worship is public has its own particular psychological value. Not only does it satisfy the instinct of

[5] See *The Religious Consciousness*, pp. 272 and 278.

gregariousness; but it is a social act on the plane of one of man's fundamental desires. More important, it adds its own elements of discipline and enrichment. It deepens the sense of loyalty to a body which does certain sacred things; and it possesses the power of carrying the soul into regions which by its own unaided insight it could never reach. Thus the individual's both tender and exalted moods find their full expression in the Church's life; moods of wilfulness and dryness are corrected by an enjoined worship which obedience makes its own; in the performance of rites set for us, not chosen by ourselves, there lies a power of healing, strengthening and growth. Something, moreover, is contributed to our picture of what God is like. And the fact that we share Him makes Christian charity easier; kinship quickens, and at the same time lightens our social obligations. Altogether the soul which grows in the atmosphere of Public Worship has richer life currents flowing through it.

Besides all this, participation in a cultus which has immemorial antecedents summons 'into the marginal region of the worshipper's consciousness the sense of a long line of past and venerated generations, of whose faith the ritual is a kind of crystallization.'[6] It represents, whether or no there be such a thing as the 'collective unconscious' of the psychologists, what Jung calls the 'primordial images, which are the deepest, most ancient, most universal thoughts of humanity.' No social group can construct for itself an entirely new ritual with the power to sweep along triumphantly the souls of men. We must not be guilty of the folly of supposing that the twentieth century can discover a new spiritual road.

Finally, under this heading of psychological value, Public Worship brings into consciousness and directs aright the tremendous energy of sublimated desire. Man has, so some-psychologists maintain, two fundamental instincts — a self-regarding instinct and an other-regarding one — under which the herd instinct, those of self-preservation, race-preservation (including sex), and others may be subsumed. These two fundamental instincts should in process of evolution become unified. 'Such unification may be brought about, or at any rate initiated, in true worship,' says Pleasance Moore-Browne in a published

[6] J. B. Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 282.

address on the Psychology of Worship. 'In the vision of God as the supreme Other, transcending all things, and of ourselves as sharing His nature — His veritable children in whom, as in all his works He is immanent — we may glimpse the ultimately paradoxical unification of the two instincts.'

I do not propose to enter into a more detailed treatment of Public Worship under this heading of psychology; you will recognize in what I have said the principles of education generally acceptable to that science. Even apart from the truth of a religion, there would be an educational effectiveness which the teaching profession will appreciate in the whole age-long method of Public Worship. The Christian Church was expert in practical psychology long before the term was heard of, and indeed she inherited the method from her pagan forbears. The need to continue to purify it does not invalidate the method itself.

(2) The second educational value of Public Worship may be seen by studying it in relation to the two stages through which a normal education passes: a passive and an active, an elementary and a higher. In the first phase, education is in facts, in law and custom: the pupil opens himself to the sway of unquestioned authorities; and as it is in school, so in church. In language, the pupil receives the meanings of words and how to use them; in arithmetic, likewise with numbers; in history, dates, incidents and epochs in their sequence; in geography, the positions and characteristics of places; in physics, laws of matter and their application to the uses of life; in morals and manners, the usages of society and the laws and constitution of a country; —and in worship, the rites, laws, history, dogmas and traditions of the Church Visible. All these things he receives, and at first without question. But there comes a point in the development of the learner — who at school, or by his own private reading and experience, aided by the mere growth of intelligent life, has entered upon the active phase which is true education — when, in Mark Pattison's words, he becomes conscious of a personal force, obtains glimpses of a new world underlying the world of sense, law and custom, finds himself a member at once of two worlds, worlds distinct and yet connected, one of which

[7] *The Psychology of Worship*, p. 12—an admirable little book, except for the Appendix.

contains the key to the other. As the mass of knowledge of the sciences, of history, art and practical experience is presented to him, opening up vistas of the knowable which are humbling in their vast expanse, 'there breaks a new light in upon him; . . . His intelligence is not only the passive recipient of forms from without, a mere mirror in which the increasing crowd of images confuse and threaten to obliterate each other: it becomes active and throws itself out upon phenomena with a native force, combining or analysing them — anyhow altering them, reducing them, subjecting them, imposing itself upon them.'[8] The living life of the soul has ripened; it has broken the bonds which held it captive; the spiritual principle is born. The point at which the change takes place is impossible to mark precisely, and the development may begin early. A child of six who will not promise to do something even for a loved one until it knows what the something is has already begun to exert conscious judgment and will, to stand over against the outside world; but the point described by Mark Pattison is still far to reach. During the process of growing towards it, and when it *is* fully reached, he who is trained in private and Public Worship is at a great advantage. In the new world to which his new outlook introduces him, he is not as one 'moving about in worlds half-realized'; already he knows it well; it has been his home since he was born, the spiritual world where God lives and the whole company of heaven. And the light which breaks upon his soul, What is it but the light already known by name and even dimly understood, 'the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world'?

The public worshipper, I say, is at a great advantage when he enters upon the second phase of education; but this does not mean that his conception of Public Worship itself does not come within its province. It does. At the point when he looks on knowledge in this second way which I have been describing, Public Worship also is transformed for him. His mind begins to play upon the map which he has received of the spiritual world under the forms of sense, custom, visual image and spatial metaphor: also upon that elementary conception of the Church as an exclusive Society which regards incorporation

[8] See Sermon V.

within itself as conveying *ipso facto* spiritual privilege. If his Public Worship is of a kind adequate to his expanding educational development, then he completes his education harmoniously within its cultus; but worshipping God now in spirit and in truth, perceiving ritual to be more than ceremonial, passing naturally through symbol to the Reality which underlies it; united in his soul to, and made whole by, the Eternal Christ; realizing the Church to be Christ's instrument — and nothing if not that — for transforming and redeeming the world.

We perceive then that Public Worship has a place — an accelerating place — within the broad scheme of a progressive education; and that if it is at its best, souls that are mature as well as souls that are simple find their truest place within it.

(3) The third great educational worth of Public Worship is its power of generating spiritual values, and thus of being a means of progress in the world. It is a commonplace of anthropology that a religious system is a normal and essential part of every evolving society. When Public Worship declines there is a lamentable decline also in civilization. Constituted as men are, all religion has its institutional element; and great as are the evils to which mistaken worship can inflame men, yet religion, including its institutional frame, can be and has been the main instrument of human cleansing and inspiration. And this, mainly through its Public Worship. Man is a rational, moral and aesthetic being, and Christian Public Worship can educate him in all three aspects: rationally in the fostering of truth; morally, by sacrifice, duty and courage; aesthetically, through beauty in many forms.

So far as truth is concerned, in Public Worship less uncertainly than in private prayer we chiefly learn *to know*, not to gain knowledge; to direct our *faith* to true objects, though apprehensible by reason; 'to know Thee, the only God, and Jesus Christ, Whom Thou hast sent.' But this, when the intellect also is brought into free service, is the highest office of man's reasonable nature; faith and discursive thought are interpenetrated in the unity of his higher Reason. Also, in Public Worship, private idiosyncrasies are curbed; the true proportion of the Faith is established. It begets a habit of mind which combines the rational with the moral education of man, and, to use some

words of Dr. Major's,[9] it 'creates a spirit of optimism, confidence in the essential goodness of the Universe and the essential righteousness of the Divine Government; the conviction . . . that all things work together for good to them that love God. Such a faith is bound to reflect itself, not only in the character and conduct of the individual who has it, but also in the whole life of a community composed of such faith-possessing individuals. Such a faith will not only make for social well-being but also for mental and physical health.' Are not these things the concern also of education? Moreover, to worship the truth as it is manifested to us in Jesus must also promote truthfulness in all things — not least in religious matters. A phrase of a well-known philosopher, A. N. Whitehead, is worth remembering: 'The ages of faith are the ages of rationalism.'[10]

Another supreme value which Christian Public Worship engenders — one among many in the moral field — is a richer conception of self-sacrifice as self-dedication. Beginning with the self-discipline of set observances, its obligations are ultimately expressed not only in understanding, and taking pains for, individuals but also in practical forms of social righteousness. Sacrifice is an inherent religious conception, but in the sacraments of Christian Public Worship it is set forth in a new light as a personal agency for world-redemption. Even the true worshipper's passion to present to God a sacrifice worthy of His holiness ceases to express itself in an offering of the Lamb of God as a sacrificial *victim*, and becomes, in thankful humble union with the self-offered sacrifice of Jesus once for all, the dedication of the worshipper himself — all he has and does — to carrying out the Divine Will on earth in the fellowship of the brethren. How energizing, how sufficient, is this agency for re-creating society, compared with the policies which work from without, inwards.

Nor is Public Worship really complete without the element — already prominent in private prayer — of moral courage. Self-surrender is itself a form of courage. But more intimately even than this, the worship of God is an adventure of the spirit. 'The worship of God,' it has been said, 'is not a rule of safety.'

[9] Article in *The Church and the Twentieth Century*. Ed., G. L. H. Harvey.

[10] *Religion in the Making*, p. 73.

Nor is 'Safe home in port' a frame of mind the Christian worshipper can rest in. True worship requires the outgoing temper, answering to the call 'Launch out into the deep.' And it begets, with the high sense of mission, also the high hope of adventure in every social and religious experiment. Where reform is needed, Christian men are apt to be in deadly fear — even 'where no fear *is*' — unless they have launched out, perhaps in real company with the saints in heaven only, in self-forgetful worship. But things done well, and with no other thought but to do them well in God's service, exempt themselves from fear. Moreover, things done well are achievements, completed; done, for all practical purposes, once for all. And often those who have shared whole-heartedly in Public Worship share most courageously in active reforms.

There is also a value fostered by Christian Worship which has reference specially to man's aesthetic nature. Plato bids us ascend through Love and through the transitory objects which are beautiful to that which is Beauty itself. How much more should we do so in worship when we have seen true Beauty in the character of Jesus Christ! Our response to that vision includes not only the beauty of holiness but also the dedication of human art. 'Art,' says Percy Dearmer, 'I would define as the expression of spiritual values in terms of beauty.' It is homage which man seeks to offer to the Divine Perfection. Thus Public Worship gives a place, in varying degrees, to the beauty perceived by the eye, ear and heart — to beauty of colour, form and movement; of music, both choral and instrumental; of language, and harmony of thought; to the beauty of grace and dignity in architecture and the minor arts related to all these. The tradition of our great Divines and the beauty, both sensuous and spiritual, of our English Bible, set the standard for the best achievements of our Public Worship, which through its various forms of beauty educates and ennobles the worshipper.

But the education that we thus acquire is not only direct through our aesthetic nature; it is also indirect, through the corrective provided by the beauty of our Services both for the contempt and the over-estimation of Matter. Symbol and sacrament find their whole meaning in the relation of matter to spirit; and beauty is the link.

These then—faith, self-sacrifice, courage, loveliness—and other spiritual values are created or fostered by Public Worship. But only so because it is the truest response to the vision of Reality; while only in so far as it is the heart's true worship can it retain its creativeness.

IV. We have been considering Public Worship in the ideal. In practice, these essential qualities of it are not to be found everywhere, or in the same proportion; and I must now consider briefly how its various types can best be brought to actualize the greatest educational values.

Broadly speaking, the three types of worship which I have described are all represented in our Church of England. Each of the first two has its peculiar excellence; each also has its dangers. The cosmic and sacrificial type tends to lead the worshipper to a kind of vicarious religion, in which all is done for him by the priest at the altar and by means of the drama of worship generally, through its singers, lights and incense. He *may* lose himself in adoration, awe and praise, and rise with passionate soul to the feet of God Himself; but also he *may* be misled by a half-sensuous emotion into thinking he has prayed because he has felt remote, or 'lifted up.' His dangers are those of unreality: namely, a severance between his religion and the actual world, whose facts and discoveries are not allowed to impinge upon it; whence comes a narrowing of sympathies and rigidity of outlook that amount to a shirking of moral issues and to a spirit of exclusiveness the very opposite of Christ's; all of which may ultimately fix a sense of God as distant and 'quite other,' in a way which cancels out the loving Father of Jesus Christ. The imagination, untrammelled, cut off from the other voices of life and experience, may create its own world; the hope of a divine revelation through man's normal faculties may fade away, and the very value of truth thus apparently unreachable grow dim. Historically, the common run of people in countries where this type of worship predominates have shewn a much looser sense of moral responsibility, especially towards truthfulness in speech and action, than have those whose worship is of the second type. The Catholic has of course his *religious* truth, a supernaturally communicated system of fixed and unquestionable propositions; and these his worship stamps upon his mind

with all the strength inherent in an age-long cultus. The aim, in the very words of Newman, is 'to pour truth into the mind and seal it up in perpetuity.'[11] The educational value of Public Worship conducted with this object is not, however, the higher education of which I spoke earlier. It does not further the perfection of the whole man; even though meditation on the truths received does enrich the soul and can produce its special type of noble, saintly character.

The second type of Public Worship has its dangers of an opposite kind. Here, too little use is made of the senses and the imagination, and too much of the will. All is clear and intentional on the part of each worshipper; and such poetic imagery as is used is derived almost exclusively from the Old Testament and *The Apocalypse*. The Jewish element predominates, as did the Pagan in the first type; and there is a corresponding narrowing of the field, a proportionately greater stress in this case on moral action. *The Psalms*, intensely heartfelt, beautiful and elevating as are many of them, nevertheless when used indiscriminately tend to produce a self-righteous and eudaemonistic religion. A God Whose Fatherhood is limited by rules, Whose love we may deserve, and shall scarcely get unless we do deserve it! How complacent, or again how hopeless, grows the outlook! Again, the emotions, if they are measured and repressed, may tend to sink away; and the solitariness of the inner life may reduce the Christian-family aspect of a Divine Service to that of a collection of well-behaved, well-intentioned units; while too little suggestiveness may attach to the bare walls and bare altar; and a lack of inward stillness in the presence of God may tend to follow from the bodily movement, since the type of Public Worship commonly shared is remote from the dramatic and consists chiefly in Services of the type of the Morning and Evening Prayer of the Prayer Book.

By reaction, the Christian elements in this type of worship may become too weakly sentimental; or its expression of the Gospel may take 'the blood and thunder' form. In the former case, so far as there is intellectual conviction, worship provides a setting for instruction in Christianity conceived simply as ethics. In the latter case, the dangers are obsession with the

[11] See *The Office and Work of Universities*, pp. 22 ff.

joys of Paradise and the means of escape 'from the wrath to come.' Its nearest approach to stylised corporate worship is the singing of psalms and hymns; and it becomes but the scene of the soul's heartfelt appropriation of salvation through emotional faith in Christ's merits.

None of these forms of Divine Service is in the true and long line of the Church's tradition of Public Worship which is our 'reasonable service.' We may look upon them as types and shadows of true worship, but they have no firm roots in our rational part. They cannot win the full reverence of the educationalist.

How can these dangers be avoided, and the true educational value of our Public Worship be brought to its maximum? Assuredly not by uniformity. Nothing can be more certain than that human souls have each their own combination of the priestly and prophetic outlook, and human characters each their own degree of demonstrative close-linking between body and mind. Some will feel intensely and not move an eyelid; others, without self-expression would perish. Some are dominated in common life by the imagination and receive truth chiefly by intuitions; others are guided by well-balanced judgment, and their observation, reason and will are for them the organs of Divine Revelation. Therefore some diversity of Public Worship is right and good for the Christian Church to favour. The essential elements are all in our set Services as the Book of Common Prayer has framed them; but the proportions and some of the modes of expression need alteration, while some conceptions need to be eliminated and others introduced, to meet both the revolutionized background of our modern thought and the deeper understanding of the Gospel which has now been reached. Our outlook is affected deeply by our cosmogony, and it is important that the system presented to us in worship should not conflict with that derived from Science and other forms of our experience; while it is untrue to Christ to teach that God requires propitiation, and the Parousia is irrelevant to the Christian Revelation. There is need for a thorough revision to be carried out in the spirit of absolute sincerity, in the atmosphere of learning and of direct responsibility to God, so that we may obtain a proper synthesis of all the necessary elements — includ-

ing the Pagan and the Jewish — in new forms of Public Christian Worship of indubitable educational value. We should not wish to reject entirely the traditional part, but to maintain its freshness of sense and purpose, so that every word that is spoken in worship we may fully mean. When this has been done, the problem of Public Worship will have been solved, the problem which, I must emphasize once more, is really constituted by the tension between the priestly and the prophetic, the traditional and the personal, the cosmic and the Christian. The final synthesis, if I may put it so, must be prophetic-priestly — in that order — not priestly-prophetic. Such worship only will be rational worship. Truthfulness will predominate within it, while there will yet be due allowance for the sense of mystery. Beauty will shine out from it, yet be directed with a technical perfection and a pregnant symbolism which shall make it dignified and worshipful. Stillness will have a place within its general scheme of more, and also more varied, forms. Local and temporal elements within it will not be such as to dim the sense of unity it should give us with other Christians living and with those who have gone on before. Its atmosphere will not be such as to hypnotize the powers of the higher self : it will be the loving attitude of disciples gathered round Jesus, their Lord. Its effect will be a bracing of the will to service in and of the Kingdom of God. Thus it will be the direct utterance, the living expression of the aroused Christian consciousness, the Public Worship of men and women who are growing into the fullness of the stature of Christ — greater than, but including, the fullness of their own personality to the utmost of its capabilities; a Public Worship which will therefore have a value *fully* educational. But to obtain it, educationalists must press for it without ceasing; and the clergy must find a means of using what experts in worship and liturgiology—not mere antiquarians—can and will provide for them.

THE RELATION OF HISTORY AND ART TO RELIGION IN MODERN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

By T. F. Coade, M.A., Headmaster of Bryanston School, Blandford, Dorset.

THE subject of this paper is far too vast to be dealt with comprehensively in forty-five minutes. I shall begin, therefore, by asking to be allowed to include Literature under the heading of Art, where it properly belongs for the purposes of this paper. I shall make no attempt to study the countless problems which the title suggests from a scholar's standpoint (not having the necessary scholarship myself), still less shall I detail a curriculum to show how History and Art can be correlated with modern Christian teaching in an ideal time-table. I shall try simply to consider, to contemplate, these three forms —Religion, History and Art—in which the spirit of God makes contact with, presses upon, operates through his creature Man; I will consider also the nature of Man's response in each of these three relationships. In fact, I shall try to see, and enable you to see, this threefold subject from the point of view of Relationship.

This paper falls into three parts: consideration of (i) the relationship between the human and divine nature; the relationship between the individual Man and God the father; *i.e.* religion in its more particular sense. (ii) The relationship of time and eternity; the relationship between Man as a member of a brotherhood and God as revealed in the person of Jesus Christ, who was 'the first-born of many brethren'; *i.e.* the relationship between Man and God in history. (iii) The relationship between space and infinity; the relationship between man the creator (and in particular man the artist) and God the Creator Spirit; in other words, the relationship between God and Man in Art.

Before suggesting to you the relationship between Man and God established in religion, I would like to explain in part what

I mean by 'God.' I mean rather more than a 'spiritual background,' or an impersonal, if inexhaustible, source of spiritual power. I mean quite explicitly, *inter alia*, the master mind, active, creating, loving — outside the orbit of our human comprehension, no doubt, but certainly to some degree (in increasing degree) comprehensible in space and time to our human understanding; consciously 'contactable' by the human mind according to the degree of its maturity. I mean, too, a personal God — personal at all events in so far as he is capable of understanding, sympathizing with, and directing (with our co-operation) all those emotional, intellectual and spiritual actions and reactions that make each of us a person.

In considering religion, we are considering finite Man's relationship with the infinite God, the relationship of a mortal creature indwelt by a seed of fire from the undying fire, a creature whose growth and destiny are fulfilled in proportion as that eternal spark is nursed into flame by the breath of God, *i.e.* by the establishment of an ever-growing mutually responsive relationship with his spiritual source.

In our early years priest and teacher are capable of playing a very large part in furthering or hindering the process of our establishment of this relationship. And one of the most serious mistakes we make in dealing with young people is to regard religion as a *subject* — either a subject in the school curriculum or a weekly incident in the life of the adult. A habit of labelling one or more periods in the week 'Divinity' or 'Divine Service' and, more or less, leaving religious education at that, does perhaps more than we suspect to queer the pitch at the outset. It gives, without our meaning it, an official sanction to the departmentalization of an activity that is virtually killed the moment it is departmentalised. Religion is not a subject; it is an activity, an attitude, a way of living, of which we become more or less aware according to our conscious need. It is all or nothing. To quote from an article in *The Times* last month :

> 'A man who becomes a true Christian does not merely add religion, as he might add philosophy or a knowledge of art, to his previous equipment; rather he becomes in St. Paul's phrase "a new creature." He is not enriched at one point, he is changed in all. His whole outlook on the world, his approach to his work, to his social life, to the public affairs of his time, will be altered, because all will be dominated by an underlying consciousness of things unseen and eternal.'

I.

Let us then examine the first of these three relationships of Man with God : his relationship in religion.

In religion man's relationship with God is immediate and personal, *i.e.* it involves the art of personal communion with the unseen spiritual source of our life, the mind and heart of that universe of which we are each, individually, a significant and unique part or expression, able to function and grow only in so far as we are in dynamic contact with that source. The medium of contact is the individual human personality in which the image of God is latent, dormant, until by a combination of our own effort, that of our educators, and the divine power of God himself, it is awakened to a sense of its divine origin, and to the need for conscious communion with it. The means of contact is not, I think, the emotions primarily (though emotion must provide the motive power behind the means.) The means of contact is the human will. Attempts at prayer fail and founder more often than for any other reason because it is not realized that prayer is chiefly a matter of the will. Of course, each man must find his own method of prayer, but I do not believe he can ever establish a strong, secure relationship with God until he is able habitually to hold himself towards God for periods, long or short, as one holds one's cold hands out towards a fire, or as one exposes one's body to the sun, deliberate acts of the will which require concentration, determination, patience and practice. Moreover, this exposing of oneself to the fire or the sun presupposes radiant activity on the part of the fire and the sun. Just so is the relationship of man with God reciprocal, mutual. Indeed, the part God plays, fortunately for us, is constant; it is our side of the process that is uncertain and spasmodic. God is always, as we acknowledge, 'more ready to hear than we to pray'; and it seems to me to be one of the prime objects of Christian teaching to educate the will towards prayer (I use the word prayer here in a sense distinct from that of intercession).

That is one aspect of the relationship—the practised bending of the human will towards God. There is another aspect or attitude we need to cultivate, to educate—willingness. Will and willingness are, as it were, two sides of the same coin; or per-

haps are better compared with swimming and floating. Before we exercise our will we need to acquire the faculty of patient waiting for the impact or guidance of God's will, just as the man sailing a boat must wait for the wind without which he cannot progress towards his goal; and he must learn the art of adapting himself to it, of accepting whatever wind comes; and he must conform the movements of his hands on the ropes and tiller to this wind which blows 'where it listeth.' It is pschologically out of the question to 'will' ourselves into making 'decisions.' We must learn to listen; then decision will result; we must learn to obey.

Man's relationship with God is conditioned primarily, then, by this twofold attitude of willingness—receptivity, acceptance; and its corollary, the exercise of the will — the positive spontaneous choosing to align one's will with the will of God in active co-operation with that universal law which operates in the spiritual world. The maintenance of this attitude is made possible only by faith. Not by belief; belief is intellectual conviction based on experience. Faith comes before, not after, experience. Without experience (experiments) faith is a dead thing. Justified by experience, faith shapes itself into belief. It is by faith that man becomes a friend of God. By faith he chooses to act deliberately (as in relationship with any other friend) *as if God were*; and so he finds that God *is*.

I think it makes it easier to realize the significance of the life and experience of Jesus when we realize that human personality is the medium of our relationship with God. For we see in the person of Jesus the *exemplar* of the perfect relationship between Man and God, established under the same circumstances as we ourselves are placed, *i.e.* in the setting of an earthly span, and subject to all the obstacles and embarrassments of time and space. For many of us I believe that our hope of achieving a satisfactory relationship with God is inspired and reinforced by considering the life of Jesus from this point of view.

What is the nature of this relationship? That of a father and son, as is demonstrated often enough in the life and in the parables of Jesus · one of mutual responsiveness, mutual faith, deriving their reality, their vitality from the free choice of each

to work with the other, a freedom without which, between man and God or between man and man, there can be neither growth nor love. It is a relationship which gives to those who have attained it a peculiar sense of balance and purpose allied with, and expressing itself in, that joy which was to the pagan world the unique characteristic of the early Christians.

On God's side is the steady pressure, the insistent seeking, the all-embracing love. And our response? Our response must be an unreserved giving of ourselves, heart, mind, soul and strength, in worship and glorification of God; giving ourselves not only with our lips but in our lives, by making the very most of every gift, talent, opportunity he gives us. That, I take it, is the meaning of 'the first and great commandment.' And 'the second is like unto it'; which brings us to our consideration of history.

II.

If in religion we are concerned with the immediate personal relationship of the individual man with God, in history we are concerned with the relationship of man with man in God; with the relationship of the infinite with the finite in time. And to the Christian, it seems to me that history must be conceived and taught as the record of man's long wrestling in time towards finding a satisfactory state of communal relationship with his fellows. His failures up to date—and they have been legion—have been almost invariably due to his failure to grasp what Jesus consistently taught and demonstrated, namely, that a satisfactory relationship between man and man can be achieved only after man first has found a satisfactory relationship with God. All power has been given to man, and his failure or true success, both as an individual and as a member of the community, depends on how he uses this power. Those men, those leaders, who have grasped spiritual power and used it in accordance with God's law have been the instruments of human progress in history, the initiators of new life. Those who have become intoxicated with it and have used it, wittingly or unwittingly, for their personal advancement or for the exaltation of any section of humanity at the expense of others, are those who have caused and perpetuated war, hatred and confusion.

In Lord Dunsany's new play *Alexander* we are introduced to Alexander the Great at the height of his greatness, which we observe to be the outcome of his having always, up to date, consulted an Old Man, who turns out to be the priest or personification in human form of the god Apollo. Alexander is persuaded to dispense with the Old Man's counsel and presence, and to show the world that he can conquer it without divine help, even in defiance of the divine will. He is all too easily persuaded that he himself is a god, the son of Zeus; and from that moment his deterioration and downfall begin. The play is a parable which it would not be difficult to duplicate many times in history. In the story of Joan of Arc, there are moments when she herself seems to be confused as to when it is God's will and when it is her own she is following. There seems to me to be indications that the development of Hitler is following similar lines to that of Alexander in the play. I am convinced he saw himself once as the instrument of God's will. Then there must have come to him some experience analogous to the 'temptations' of Jesus, when, being faced as Jesus was with the choice between spiritual domination of his own people (and the world in general) and the acceptance of the rôle of mediator, *i.e.* the rôle of awakener of faith, not in himself but directly in God, he chose the former, whereas Jesus chose the latter.

I believe it is worth considering briefly the Nazi standpoint in any Christian survey of history, because it is perhaps the greatest and most direct logical anti-Christian movement in history. Like Christianity, it has some spiritual elements; hence its power, which is within its own limits irresistible. Like the Christian, the Nazi recognizes the two functions of the human will I have referred to, *viz.* the positive, active, choosing will and willingness. The essential difference is that the Christian puts willingness first—willingness to accept and wait for the revelation of God's will, and then with his will, his power of positive whole-hearted choice, he acts in accordance with what has been revealed to him in his state of willingness. The Nazi wills, chooses first, in accordance with the will of the State expressed through his leader; and only after that choice is made he offers himself in an ecstasy of self-immolation in obedience to his leader's will. The leader's will, being to the Christian

patently out of harmony with, if not opposed to God's will or law as Christ revealed it, can only lead in the long run to disaster such as has come upon all races, creeds and classes which limit their loyalty and love to anything less than the brotherhood of man. In the world as it is to-day, the scale of resultant tragedy must be proportionately vaster than at any previous period in history. The neglected truth is that all spiritual power used for ends other than the glory of God leads sooner or later, by one route or another, to ruination.

When I suggested the willingness of the Nazi to endure all things in the service of his ideal, I would except failure; material or spiritual failure is the one thing the Nazi fears, as he knows that one such failure would wreck everything. Christianity is the one religion that is capable of deriving strength from apparent failure because of its power to transform failure into success, its power to rise like the phoenix from the ashes. It would be true to say that Christianity is founded on man's weakness, in the sense of his complete dependence on God for his strength. All through history, in individual leaders and in nations, we meet again and again this ὕβρις, this tendency to reject God and trust to our own growing sense of power, physical and intellectual, to depart from the divine pattern and make a new pattern according to the desire of our own hearts. In church history and in secular history we see man, conscious of the immensity outside himself, absorbing more and more into his own province, taking more and more upon himself, puffing himself up like the child in its most truculent phase of development, until such an attitude becomes fully conscious in the emergence of a movement like National Socialism. Always the error is the same—to put the exercise of the human will before that willingness which Christ taught and practised.

So far as I know, the Jewish nation is the only race that has ever consciously organized its life and seen its history in direct relationship with the operation of the laws of the spiritual world, as they understood them. The irony of Jewish history seems to me to be that when the logical fulfilment of their most exalted spiritual expectations came in the person of Jesus Christ the Jews failed to see His significance, because they had already rejected the conclusion logically following their unique dis-

covery of the universality of God's power. The conclusion of the universality of God's love when presented to them by Christ they could not accept, and they refused Him because He could not be a nationalized Messiah. Through having cultivated the same kind of creed as Germany is cultivating to-day, the separatist racial spirit, centred in the Law—through having lost elasticity and adaptability, their skin, grown dry and arid, could not, or would not, endure the strain of the new wine, which was therefore carried elsewhere and poured for the most part into bottles which for totally other reasons were scarcely better prepared to receive it, the Caucasian temperament being far less susceptible to the Spirit than that of almost any other race. The history of Western Civilization is, from this standpoint, the record of the revelation of Jesus fermenting in the hearts of men and nations who were by nature not best fitted to receive it, and of the consequent wars, upheavals and revolutions, including those at present in full swing.

All the great Hebrew leaders had this sense of direction by the divine will—Abraham, Moses, Samuel, Elijah, and the great prophets right down to Jesus. Inherent in them is a common faith in some attribute of God which upholds them in their crisis. What is this attribute? The answer is *the divine law or order* underlying human life and experience.

It is an established fact that in every human heart there is the capacity at birth, the longing, the desire, not only after truth, beauty and goodness, but after law and order too. I am not suggesting that the spirit of God did not begin to move in the human heart till the dawn of Jewish history; but I do suggest that the Jewish race, as represented by its greater Prophets, achieved the highest conception of Universal Law so far attained by man, and that Jesus, by revealing the fact that love is the fulfilment of this Universal Law, provided the social animal man with the key to the only door that can lead to universal brotherhood and peace. It is therefore imperative that we should not misconceive love as an easy thing or as an easy way of life. It is in every way as hard to live in obedience to the law of love as to live *e.g.* in conformity with the law of the land. Faith in love is the basis of wisdom;

moreover, the desire for discipline is also the *beginning* of wisdom; it is also the beginning of history; and it is the first evidence of man's kinship with his spiritual origin when he begins to guess this and act upon it.

In God's relationship with man in history, what then is the medium in which the spirit works? It is in the heart of man the social animal. And what are the means? Surely the means are the stuff of human emotion that sways and boils and turns this way and that, till here and there at the rarest intervals and as yet only on a tiny scale the truth is discovered that man can live in harmony with man only when his emotional violence is controlled by his will and directed in a steady flow of energy towards fellowship. That is the meaning of love.

To the Christian, history can be envisaged and taught only as summed up in Jesus Christ. The history of the Jewish race —the religious race *par excellence*—was summed up in the person of Jesus. In Him was embodied the culmination of the law, *i.e.* love. In Him was incarnated the Spirit of God in so far as the infinite could be housed in the finite. As *Christ*, Jesus embodied not only what had gone before, but what was to come. As Christ He was the great forerunner, the foreshadower of man as he had it in him to be. He is Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. Two thousand years after His death, He still towers far above us; yet I believe we need to consider Him not as an impossible ideal, but as the norm. His immortality does not consist in His having been remembered and imitated for two thousand years; He is immortal because he is yesterday, to-day and for ever, the normal man. And a Christian must regard perfection, not as the exception, but as the normal human state, and all that falls short of it as being subnormal. All theories of history are transformed, transfigured by His light, and the true pattern comes through in His light, much as the pattern painted on a certain kind of lamp shade, invisible when the light is turned off, is revealed when the light is turned on.

III.

The relationship of God with man in art (as contrasted with religion and history) is essentially impersonal. The medium is necessarily something material, or at all events other than

self — stone, paint, clay, brick, words, sound. I am here concerned chiefly with visual art, in which the relationship of God to man is as between the infinite and *space* (but what I say refers essentially, I think, also to literature and music).

To arrive at any conclusion we must be dogmatic about what art is. I think we must say that a work of art, to deserve that title, must arouse a peculiar and quite definite kind of emotion (though the emotions themselves may differ according to the different objects of art). This particular kind of emotion is awakened by a certain specific quality common to all art, and I am very content to accept Clive Bell's ruling on this point.

> 'What quality is shared by all objects that provoke our aesthetic emotions?' he asks, in his book *Art*. 'What quality is common to Sta. Sophia and the windows at Chartres, Mexican sculpture, a Persian bowl, Chinese carpets, Giotto's frescoes at Padua, and the masterpieces of Poussin, Piero della Francesca, and Cézanne? Only one answer seems possible — *significant form*. In each, lines and colours combined in a particular way, certain forms and relations of forms, stir our aesthetic emotions. These relations and combinations of lines and colours, these aesthetically moving forms, I call "Significant Form"; and "Significant Form" is the one quality common to all works of visual art.'

This significant form is independent of life as we know it in every-day mundane experience; it signifies qualities that belong to the world of reality beyond ordinary human ken. Artists in a special way, and we in a limited way, have faculties, strands of our being, that link us with that world, and through these *media* we more or less dimly recognize unearthly beauty through the form of works of art. The artist is the priest of invisible form; his creative work is, in a sense, his prayer; he has deeper insight and greater skill than the rest of us, that enabled him to see what we cannot see, and recreate it so that the less insensitive among us who contemplate his work can sometimes catch a glimpse of the reality reflected through his genius. Most men seem devoid of this artistic sense; some few have it: I do not know how far it is educable. I do not know whether children can be educated towards artistic appreciation. I do know that children are more likely to recognize and even produce works of artistic merit when they are young than after they have been subjected to the intellectualizing process of education at present in force. One of our educational problems is how to

preserve through adolescence the faculty for wonder and the faculty for artistic expression that so rarely survives to-day beyond the age of fifteen.

Even if I had the time and skill, I have not the experience to dilate on 'what is art,' beyond what I have said.

What I am sure of is that in every true work of art, there is present the quality of timelessness, or perhaps spacelessness, and that man's life is ineffably enriched if he has the faculty of recognizing this fourth dimensional quality in works of art. And as the mystic or contemplative experiences 'eternity in an hour,' so the artist can see 'a world in a grain of sand.' Though in terms of space the work of art is confined in a fragment, yet it has a wholeness because it is indwelt by the spirit of beauty (or form). The infinite is caught and prisoned in the finite for our dazzlement and beatification, if our vision is single enough to see it.

A work of art is an embodiment, a descent of the invisible into the visible, and expression of the infinite through the mind and hand of the finite being. The symbol of the artist's mind is the womb that receives the spirit and shapes it with the instrument of his creative imagination into a recreation of a new aspect of the hidden eternal beauty beyond the limited vision of most of us.

How then must we look at Religion, Art, History? Essentially as three expressions of human activity by means of which man is able to enter into relationship with the unseen spiritual world of which our mortal life is a shadow or reflection. Directly if we are spiritually gifted, or indirectly through the medium of the mystics, artists, seers and historians if we are ordinary people, we can draw strength, inspiration, help from the contacts, from the vision we are able to achieve.

The artist achieves the ideally balanced relationship between the unseen world of beauty and the material world; he acts as a bridge between the two worlds translating invisible beauty into concrete visible form; and if we approach his work in the right spirit, we too can share something of his ecstasy, his exaltation.

The life of Jesus furnishes us with the example of the perfectly balanced relationship between God and man, as an in-

dividual and as a member of the community. He, too, is the eternal bridge, the mediator between God and man. I think the greatest of Jesus' 'temptations' must have been to win the world by that tremendous spiritual domination attainable by those who have the faith to live in the NOW, to live outside time, outside the ordinary laws of time that limit human thought and action in history. It was his great *love* for man that overcame that temptation and made him choose the harder way — the way that became the way of the Cross. The descent from the mount of transfiguration to the crowd round the epileptic is symbolic of His whole attitude of bringing the power and strength from His contact with the eternal into the sphere of the temporal, in the face of human need. His life itself, from birth through to baptism, temptation, crucifixion, resurrection and ascension, is a symbol in time, a map of the way every man must go who would know the meaning of eternal life. Thus we can regard each human life — and notably the life of Jesus Himself — as a fragment which is also a symbol of the infinite.

And just as Jesus' life (or the life of any man) has this symbolic significance, so each of the events of history, in addition to its significance in the historical chain of cause and effect, has an eternal significance in relation to man's growth towards God. Jesus Himself was not interested in the great History of the Hebrew race primarily as a record of historical events, but rather as a record of God's dealings with men, and in each triumph or defeat as significant of the success or failure of man to adapt himself to the will of God.

Supposing we believe all this, or part of it, what are we to do? Are we to *teach* it to our parishioners and school children? Yes, and no. Very few people are capable of seeing life *sub specie aeternitatis* until they have reached a certain degree of spiritual maturity; and attempts to indoctrinate young or old before their appetite is awakened for what we wish to feed them on, commonly produce indigestion or nausea, together with a deep illogical aversion from nourishment of that kind in future. In other words, we make our task as preachers and teachers much harder than they need be by *being in too great a hurry* to dispense the truth as we see it. This applies to education in general and to 'religious education in particular.' My

own conviction grows yearly stronger that Christianity is a religion for adults, and few people are able to regard or even approach God as a father until, after long and often bitter experience, they are able to come to Him with the same childlike faith the five-year-old boy has in his earthly father. I believe that is what Jesus meant when He spoke of entering the kingdom of heaven 'as a little child.' It is our business to educate the young *towards* Christianity.

What can we do then? First cultivate our own appreciation and understanding of the Spirit, by seeking direct experience and contact with eternal truth, beauty, goodness, law in the work and personality of great masters of art and religion. In proportion as we are impregnated, vitalized by this communion with reality through them — or directly — all that we say or do about art, history and religion will be 'lit up.' By the grace of God, this light of ours may lighten a little of the darkness in other minds. That is the best we can hope. But is it so very little? It is, at all events, following Christ's own method, the method of 'peaceful penetration,' of quiet awakening, which He likened to the stirring of life in the seed, to the action of yeast whose office it is to generate buoyancy and resiliency, to the behaviour of salt whose secret and kindly function it is to bring out the full flavour of its environment.

CO-ORDINATION OF SCIENCE WITH MODERN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc., author of *What to Believe, No Casual Creed,* etc.

I.

IT is quite possible to supply education in Science without any reference to Christianity. Indeed, this is what is generally done. Science teachers do not feel that it is their business to instruct their pupils in religious doctrines and practices; they feel neither competent nor willing to do so. The principle of specialism dominates modern education, and no man ventures to trespass outside his own sphere; and the scientific specialist in a school is even less willing than his colleagues to transgress in this way—his hesitancy often being due to a certain contempt which he entertains for non-scientific subjects.

Science figures a good deal more prominently in the average school syllabus than was the case thirty years ago. An entirely new educational system has grown up since 1902, and the importance attached to Science has not only increased, but is likely to increase yet more in the future. This is inevitable, because whatever modern civilization can dispense with, it certainly cannot dispense with science. To-day the scientific technician is as indispensable as was the priest in the Middle Ages. If the supply of technicians ran short, civilization as we know it would collapse. Imagine London without transport, electricity, gas, water, or drains! Thus 'natural science is an indispensable part of the education of a citizen, because scientific discoveries affect the everyday life of everyone.'

Thus modern Christian education cannot evade the necessity of devising and following some definite policy with regard to Science, inasmuch as Science tends more and more to dominate modern education.

The important point to remember with regard to education in Science, whatever the branch of Science may be, is that it does not supply the mind with facts only, but with a method.

Facts are important, but of even greater importance are the means by which a knowledge of those facts is attained, and the mental habits which grow up as a consequence of the use of those means. Education in Science does not consist in supplying the pupil with a list of facts, but rather in acquainting him with the methods and the techniques by which those facts have been discovered and can now be proved. To supply the student with a list of facts might exercise his memory but would not improve his reasoning powers or affect his mental attitude; whereas these are the very things that an education in Science will do for him.

As is well known, in the laboratory certain methods are adopted, which are usually called experimental. That is to say, the pupil is not supplied with a theory or hypothesis without at the same time being supplied with the grounds on which the hypothesis is based, which grounds he can test for himself by experiment. In the background there is always the appeal to experience; and this is not, in the last resort, to the experience of someone else, but to the experience of the student himself. The student soon learns that there is nothing specially sacred about any scientific hypothesis. Such hypotheses are liable to be replaced at any time by others which explain the facts more simply, or will cover facts not covered by the old theories. The appeal is always to observed facts. *i.e.* to experience.

It is clear that this method of inquiry is bound to have important effects upon the mental attitude of those who are being educated in its use. Their minds become 'conditioned' to look for experimental proof of all theories, doctrines, or hypotheses offered for their acceptance. Whether we like it or not the mentality of the products of our modern schools and universities is being 'conditioned' in this manner; and it is to girls and young women, as well as to boys and young men, that this applies.

II

In seeking to introduce the pupils and students of modern schools and universities to the Christian religion, this 'conditioning' of their minds by the education they are receiving cannot be overlooked. Minds which have become accustomed to base their beliefs, opinions, and theories upon evidence that can be checked by experiment, will not easily be induced

radically to change their mental habits when the religious sphere is entered. The Head Mistress of one of the most famous of our modern Girls' Schools, has given outspoken expression to this truth. Miss M. G. Clarke, Head Mistress of the Manchester High School for Girls, has written as follows:

> 'It has to be borne in mind by those who are puzzled by the falling away of young people from Church membership that the whole educational process has been revolutionized in a generation by the substitution of experimental and heuristic methods for the older methods of authority. Young people are systematically taught to make a distinction between what they think and what they feel and to take on trust nothing that they have the chance of experiencing and proving for themselves: to expect them, at the outset of their spiritual development, to do the opposite in religion is to put the cart before the horse.'[1]

It is easily seen that the credal formularies of the Church might be difficult to present as convincing in all their articles, to a young person who had been used to checking all theories by experiment or to manufacturing theories to fit observed facts. The exponent of our Creeds might be hard put to it to enable his pupil to check by present experience every article in them. It has to be admitted that the teaching of the Church includes a great deal, *e.g.* the creation and the last judgment, which it is impossible that anyone can have experienced at all.[2] And yet, after all, what is the use of a truth to anyone if it does not fit in with, and cannot be made to fit in with, his own individual experience? A truth can only make contact with an individual through his experience; apart from this the truth, however true, lies outside him and unconnected with him. He can indeed assume it is true, and act as if it were. But this would be to attempt to test it by experience.

One can hardly avoid the conclusion that much of the debility of religion amongst us to-day is due to its being presented to us as a series of verbal propositions, many of which we have no means of checking by actual experience. And a proposition which has no direct connection with present experience remains barren and meaningless—a mere verbalism. We cannot convert such a proposition into the texture of our lives, because it cannot be linked up with the rest of our experience; it is just a rigmarole of words.

[1] *The Head Mistress Speaks* (1937), p. 72.

[2] This is pointed out by Höffding in his *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 104.

III.

A real difficulty does, of course, arise: the matter is not so simple as it might seem. The experience to which appeal is made in Science is sense-experience, and as the bodily senses of all normal individuals are very much alike, the appeal to them is one that settles the matter for everybody. But religious experience is not a matter of the bodily senses, and it would appear that different individuals are differently equipped for receiving such experience. Hence the appeal to experience is not, in the religious sphere, so universally convincing as is the same appeal in the sphere of science.

Traditional teaching of religion has, of course, been aware of this difficulty, and since it cannot appeal, like Science, to the common experience of everybody, it talks of the 'common experience of the Church.' But after all, even the experience of a Church is, when you come to examine it, the experience of individuals (since a Church is composed of such). And how can that experience be called 'common' if it is not shared by everybody? As a matter of fact, the appeal must be in the long run to the experience of the individual, and if the individual's experience, or the experience of a number of individuals, does not square with 'the common experience of the Church,' how are we to convince them that they, and not the Church, are in error?

And yet, in spite of the difficulty involved, the appeal in religion must be to experience, for the simple reason that there is nothing else to appeal to, ultimately, and perhaps the Indian writer is right when he tells us:

> 'It is not much use to talk about religion until one has felt it. What right has a man to say he has a soul if he does not feel it, or that there is a God if he does not see Him? If there is a God we must see Him, if there is a soul we must perceive it; otherwise it is best not to believe. Man wants truth, to experience truth for himself; when he has grasped it, realised it, felt it within his heart of hearts, then only will all doubts vanish, darkness be scattered, and crookedness be made straight.'[3]

Is this a counsel of perfection, or is it rather the most obvious common-sense, that only those should be expected to believe in God who can experience Him? If it be indeed a fact that the

[3] Swami Vivekananda's *Introduction to the Aphorisms of Patanjali*, p. 6.

capacity for religious experience is so rare and attenuated in normal men that it is useless to appeal to it, the conclusion to be drawn surely is that religion is not an activity for a normal man, and it would be best to abandon it altogether, or at least to leave the practice of it to a suitably gifted minority.

IV.

If we accept the view that in Religion as in Science the appeal should be to experience, and that nothing should be taught but what can be checked by present experience, it is clear that this involves a complete reversal of present methods of religious education. Although it is true that this procedure is easier to follow in the sphere of Science than in the sphere of religion, since in Science the appeal is to a genuinely 'common' experience; yet that is no reason why it should not be followed in religious education too. It may be a difficult procedure, but if it is the only effective one, we shall have to use it and make what we can of it. The failure of other time-honoured methods should at any rate encourage us to give it a trial.

We shall have to begin our religious education not with a scheme of unverified or even unverifiable doctrines which the experience of our pupils has not verified, and perhaps cannot verify at all (*e.g.* doctrines like the Creation and the Last Judgment), but we shall commence straight away with the *practice* of religion, in the hope that this will engender in our pupils the type of experience to which religion must appeal if it is to be proved true. The point is that if the proof from experience is to become central in religion as it now is in Science, *the faculties for sensing such experience must be developed.*

Religious teachers, clerical as well as lay, are unfortunately at the present time very ill-equipped to reverse successfully their present ineffective methods. Although they are strong on the theoretical side, and can state accurately the doctrines of the Church, yet about the practice of religion they know comparatively little, and their own experience in that direction is meagre. They can teach their pupils the doctrines of the Church, but they are quite incapable of teaching those same pupils how to pray. They are unable to supply any simple technique of prayer,

or self-recollection, or meditation, though it is through such practices that the experience comes by which their doctrines can be checked (where they are capable of being checked at all).

What our rising generation, with minds conditioned in the manner described above by their training in the sciences, requires is not religious doctrine, but religious practice. And by religious practice I do *not* mean ethical behaviour (though that will certainly be involved). By religious practices I mean such activities as prayer, meditation, self-recollection. If anyone says that such things are impossible for the young, he must take a very limited view of the faculties of youth. Many of the young are naturally religious, but religious practice and development are inhibited partly by their association with incredible because unprovable doctrines, and partly by their association with the idea of self-righteousness and pharisaism. It is a matter of experience that the practice of religion, in the sense indicated, will involve self-discipline and self-conquest, and so have ethical consequences; but these consequences are, in my view, a by-product only — though a valuable one. It cannot be too strongly or too often asserted that the aim of religious practices is *not* to make a man moral, still less to make him respectable, or a loyal, obedient and industrious citizen. The object of religious practice is to give the individual a wider and deeper experience of reality than he could attain to without it. If it does not do this for him it has failed of its purpose, which is to make a man 'know God.' The mistaken and utilitarian idea that religion is out to make us 'good' is responsible for the present widespread identification of religion with self-righteousness, and for the distrust and even contempt in which it is held by the more high-spirited of our younger generation. After all, who wants to be 'good' in the conventional sense, unless one wants to 'get on'? If this view of religious activity could prevail, religion would be associated with self-righteousness and unction as little as art is, and the technique of prayer could be taught with as little self-consciousness as the technique of water-colour painting, or any other form of aesthetic activity. It is high time that this change of outlook took place.

Our young people trained in Science need a religious technique far more than they need a theology, even if it be a rational-

istic theology, which of course is the only kind they could consider. It is not enough to provide our young students with a theology couched in terms of evolution or relativity. For even a rationalistic theology remains only a theology, and need have no more reference to everyday life than the differential calculus. A theology is, or should be, a map of reality; but what we require of a map is that it should show the road; what does not assist the traveller should be cut out. Pictures of dolphins do not help. There are theological statements, incapable of verification, which one can believe or disbelieve without it making any practical difference to the conduct of life, because such propositions are irrelevant to our experience, actual and potential. Just as what people require for physical health is not a mass of medical and physiological theory, but a few simple rules of health, based on a modicum of sound knowledge, so with spiritual health — the health of the self. We do not need an elaborate theology, but a simple mental technique, based on sound knowledge of our psychological make-up. This technique of mind-management, or self-management, need not be called religious if we do not like the name, for words matter not at all. What we require is not words, but to be taught how to guide our lives. Whatever words enter into the business will be rules of how to go to work — instructions given by an expert. What the rising generation, instructed in science and respecting experience, fed on theories based on verifiable facts, requires, is not verbalisms but practical guidance. This is where the Groups have scored; they do provide a technique of daily living.

What we all require, old as well as young, is to be taught efficiently how to possess our souls, how to extend the range and depth of our perceptions, how to strengthen our inner resources, how to achieve detachment, and how to attain interior peace. If our religious theories do not lead us to a technique for attaining these objects, what is the point of them? They are only so much useless lumber which ought to be thrown overboard. Science is valued because it supplies us with an efficient technique for coping with and mastering the outside world — the 'not I' world of external experience. Religion, too, would be equally valued if it supplied us with an efficient technique for coping with and mastering the interior world — the 'I' world

of inner experience. Both interior and exterior worlds are real; but the former is the more important for each of us, and also for the world at large. Mankind by Science has conquered the 'not I' world of Nature and can control it and make it supply his needs. But mankind is as yet far from conquering the 'I' world of his inner nature, which is far from being obedient to rational control. And yet, unless he can subdue this world of his own nature, it will not avail mankind to have conquered Nature outside him. He will only use the powers thus acquired in suicidal destructiveness, as he is at present doing. Until man has acquired knowledge of his own nature and control over it, his scientific knowledge and technique will avail him nothing: on the contrary, it will destroy him.

V.

As a matter of fact Science has begun to turn to the world of inner experience, though unfortunately at present it does so in the light (or darkness) of the prejudices acquired through the exclusive study of the external, 'not-I' world. Physical science treats this outside world as an automatic machine, and imitative modern psychology treats the inner world of personal experience in precisely the same way. Inasmuch as consciousness cannot be rationally represented as something automatic and mechanical, it is not surprising that the Behaviourists write it off as an illusion. Professor T. H. Huxley did the same thing. Thus modern psychology studies the world of inner experience in a manner which is bound to lead to the conclusion that such a world cannot possibly exist. Certainly if nothing is real but what is mechanical (as the physical sciences assert), neither consciousness nor mind can be real. But fortunately the consciousness and mind of the psychologist are as unreal as those of other men; so his conclusions, being the product of an unreality, are devoid of significance.

But it can hardly be doubted that psychology will succeed in liberating itself from prejudices borrowed from the physical sciences, and will examine the experiences of the inner world in a manner more befitting their importance and unique nature. And it will examine with equal detachment the abnormal as well

as the normal phenomena of that inner world, where there exists a whole ocean of activity which ordinarily does not enter into consciousness. The powers of this submerged part of ourselves will be tested, and will be found to be much greater than had been supposed in recent centuries.

When knowledge of this sort has become less speculative than it is at present, owing to the grave defects of psychological science, it will be far easier to present the narratives of the Bible as being credible because consistent with actual experience. At present the events known as miracles are quite impossible for those educated in Science to assimilate, because they seem totally incredible. Even if they are believed by an individual who can temporarily inhibit his critical faculties, they can be of no value to him because, being totally alien to his experience, they remain unconnected with him. In theory he believes them, but in practice they are nothing to him. They are not assimilable or usable truths, like the truths that fire burns or that love can bring happiness.

But when these now incredible narratives can be made to fit in with present experience, as will be the case when the science of the inner, 'I' world has begun to develop freed from the shackles which the mechanical science of the outer, 'not I' world has sought to impose upon it, the case will be different. The scientifically educated young will then be able to read Biblical narratives without complete incredulity because they will recognize the events there described as being not alien to but cognate with, their own experience. Even at present, when the science of consciousness, the mind, and their faculties is in its infancy, it is possible to present many of the miracles in terms of faith-healing, as Mr. J. M. Thompson did more than a quarter of a century ago in his *Miracles in the New Testament*, a book of Christian apologetic which the authorities of the Church were too short-sighted to welcome. It may be noted that when the science of mind has developed further, the traditional conception of Miracle, which regards it as an event having its cause outside Nature, will be even less tenable than it is to-day. For who can set limits to the potentialities of Nature, which includes ourselves and all our faculties, known and unknown? Till all Nature has been completely mapped, no one can say

where its limits lie, or what stands outside them. To assert that any event is a miracle until the whole of Nature has been explored is unwarranted.

VI

We may now sum up what has been said with regard to the co-ordination of Science with modern Christian education. Science and Christian education will not get on well together until certain changes take place in both. Orthodox Science and orthodox religion will both have to modify their methods. Orthodox religion will have to change its time-honoured habits, and begin not with doctrines but with practice, and be careful to teach no doctrines but what can be checked by experience, which the practice, if it is the right practice, will engender. As for orthodox Science; it will have to abandon its mechanistic and materialist bias, derived from physics, the most abstract of the sciences.[4]

It may be said that for religious practice to begin some doctrine is necessary. In order to pray, for example, it will be said that one must believe in God. The would-be pray-er is therefore introduced to the traditional arguments for the existence of God, the teleological, ontological, and what not. By the time he has mastered them, he has very likely ceased to want to pray. The being whose existence is precariously established by these arguments hardly seems approachable by prayer. As a matter of fact the only belief necessary to enable a man to start praying is a belief in his own consciousness, and that this consciousness has depths where it comes into contact with the source of its being — mysterious depths, which no one yet has fully probed. But even more important than any belief as a preliminary to prayer is the *desire* to pray. If a man wishes to pray, he will pray, even if his prayer is no more than, 'O God, if there be a

[4] I shall be told that physics is no longer materialist. But until it can be shown that electrons are more spiritual than atoms, the adjective 'materialist' need not be altered. Quantum mechanics, so far as I understand them, do not seem to afford much of a loophole for spontaneity to enter the system. As for Relativity, it only proves, what every philosopher knew already, that time and space are other than they appear to common sense. The New Physics is tarred with the same brush as the Old, though religious apologists (some of them physicists themselves) have tried hard to exploit it.

God, save my soul, if I have a soul.' Sincerity and reality in prayer do not depend upon correctness of belief. What our young people need, as I have said above, is a few simple rules, an elementary technique of prayer. If they could be given this, they would soon have enough experience to make them believe in a God because they would have felt Him. That their experience would enable them to believe in all the articles of the creed, or to accept the services of the Church is unlikely. But unless their teachers were mere propagandists, compassing heaven and earth to gain one proselyte, that would not greatly matter. But who will provide the rising generation with the book of Spiritual Exercises that it needs? Little volumes of piety and uplift are not what is needed; our young people deserve to be treated seriously.

As for the orthodox scientists, they are not very much more accommodating than the orthodox religionists. As the religionists are mortally afraid that if the doctrinal barrier breaks the result will be secularism, so the scientists are in terror of a recrudescence of superstition if the strict mechanism and materialism of science is questioned. If we tolerate mysticism, or admit the reality of the phenomena studied by the Society for Psychical Research, they say, we shall have witchcraft and the evil eye back again. Neither the orthodox religionists nor the orthodox scientists seem to realize that the only sure barrier to superstition is a rational religion. Materialism, whether religious or secularist, is a very insecure barrier against superstition. The religious materialist thrives on superstition while the materialistic secularist substitutes new superstitions for those sanctified by time.

Thus to co-ordinate Science with modern Christian education demands from Science that it should broaden its outlook and recognize that the science of the external 'not I' world is not the only kind of science that is possible or desirable. While from Modern Christian education it demands simply that it should be *modern*, and not put the cart before the horse by teaching religious theories of which the truth cannot be proved, before religious practices of which the efficacy can be proved quite simply.

ECCLESIA DOCENS ET DISCENS

By the Reverend A. C. Bouquet, D.D.

THE Church is said to exist in order to proclaim the Word of God, and to do for the world what Christ did. Christ obviously did not come to learn but to proclaim; He came to act revealingly and redemptively, not to discover by experience. Can the Church then do her duty if she sets to learn? She can learn from Christ and from the Holy Spirit. But has she any business to learn from 'worldly studies'? Is there any point at which the Church can stop teaching and occupy herself with learning? It would almost appear as though 'sacred learning' were her only proper business, and as though any approach to humanism must be taboo, as being both irrelevant and also calculated to weaken the proclamation of the Gospel, since human affairs stand under judgment and are deeply infected with sin. (I heard recently of a reputable lecturer in divinity who declared that he had no time to do anything but study the Bible.) On this basis it seems hard to justify the Baconian outlook for a man in holy orders (*i.e.* 'to take all knowledge as my province'). Equally on the other side it seems hard for the educational humanist to accept a valuation of Christianity which sets it apart from ordinary studies, detached, aloof, peremptory, almost despising sound learning as under judgment. Visser t'Hooft wrote an essay a few years ago entitled, 'Students find the truth to serve,' implying thereby, as it would seem, that there are different sorts of truth, *i.e.* prophetically revealed truth and empirically discovered truth, and that once the majestic nature of the former has been apprehended, it becomes almost a waste of time to serve any other. Something of this seems to be implied in the Ordinal of the English Book of Common Prayer, where the candidates for the priesthood are twice cautioned 'to forsake and set aside as much as they may all worldly cares and studies' and 'to be diligent in . . . reading of the Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh.' No doubt there was a tradition of this kind in the early centuries of the Christian movement, and it has

led Mr. Stephen Ward in writing the history of ethics to speak of the early Christian Church as marked by its disparagement of reason. But there was equally another type of Christian tradition associated with the Alexandrian fathers, which proceeded along a different line, and it was largely a sense of the difference between these two traditions which was responsible for the tension between the followers of Origen and the anti-Origenists. In the main Luther and Calvin stand with the latter, and this is partly due to the well-known difference of temper between German and Italian humanism. Renaissance south of the Alps meant something both frivolous and sinister. Luther (not without justification) set Catholicism on the same side of the line as pagan religion, and the Gospel on the other side. Modern neo-Protestantism as we see it in the pages of the Dutch scholar, Professor Kraemer, does exactly the same. It draws a distinction between Biblical realism, so-called (which is revelational and 'given') and empirical Christianity, which is merely ethnic religion under a Christian veneer.

In spite of her formularies, the genius of the English Church differs from this. Hooker, whose business it was to give a quasi-official interpretation of those formularies, did not despise natural theology, nor the reverent study of the universe, neither did John Wesley,* as we have lately learned, neither did Maurice, nor Westcott and Hort. In its nineteenth century form this association of Biblical Christianity with secular learning has lately been dubbed 'the Victorian compromise,' and we have been told that it is now *démodé*. There are however some I hope who like myself still believe in it, and are confident that we serve God best when we serve the knowledge of all truth, whether empirical or revealed. Such believe that the revelation of Christ is not a thing apart, solely to be found recorded in Scripture. They would rather say that the revelational truth mediated to us through Scripture is the guide to the finding of the revelation of Christ in all that we can come to know. 'All things that the Father hath are mine,' says the Johannine Christ, and Scripture gives us a way of approach to all questing for truth about things as they really are. It is only by approaching any branch of study in the Spirit engendered by Jesus Christ

* See article by W. L. Doughty in *M.C.*, May 1938.

that we can be sure of being able to study with profit, and in such a manner as to induce what we are studying to yield up its results, and to tell us the truth about itself.

We must conclude then that the Anglican attitude to knowledge is not a mere compromise, but is grounded in Scripture, and that in order to be able to teach well and truly, the Church must be a learner from every direction, and that in such learning she will be led by the Spirit, who will take of the things of the Father and show them to her. Into the Church are to be brought the desirable things of all nations. This was the theme of a book published in the early pre-war days of this century and written by seven Anglican Bishops—*Mankind and the Church*, in which the contribution of each nationality—what the pundits of the Third Reich would call its '*nomos*'—was duly assessed.

But having got thus far, we are bound to dissociate ourselves from what has been called mere humanistic relativism. We have inherited something which we dare not let go. The true modernist Christian is not merely an adventurous humanist. He has in his keeping that which is Absolute and Final, and seeks to interpret It to others, and to interpret life and all that it contains by this same treasure: and what is true of the individual Christian is equally true of the Church.

I venture to dwell upon this point for two reasons. First, because the teacher in any day-school, whether primary or secondary, is inclined to be muddled about the basis upon which his Scripture teaching is to be built. I have not had the opportunity of listening to all the other papers read at this Conference, and so I may find myself overlapping a little at this juncture. But I am compelled to ask: 'What reason can any teacher supply to self or colleagues for teaching the Christian Scriptures with zest and interest?' With a crowded syllabus, there can be no safeguard against relegating them to the background unless they are more than 'ancient literature with a certain cultural value.' The only answer worth giving in my judgment is that the Scriptures are the documentary evidence for the content and nature of a Stupendous Event in history, towards which all previous history looked and led, from which all subsequent history is fertilized,[1] and by which all subsequent history

[1] Cf. *John* xiv, 12 and 26; xvi, 13, 14, 15.

is judged. Grant the truth of that answer, and Scripture, intelligently taught, becomes the indispensable background to all other studies in school, as well as to all spare-time activities. But reject that answer, or take up a non-committal attitude towards it, and Scripture-teaching at once becomes a boring and tedious occupation, gladly discarded on any excuse — as of course it is all over the country by dozens of teachers. (The battle is admittedly being lost in those provincial universities and training colleges where no definite and intelligible Christian background to secular studies is being provided.)[2]

My second reason for dwelling upon the Final and Absolute Element in Christianity is somewhat different. I have already referred to Professor Kraemer's distinction between Biblical realism and empirical Christianity. It may seem as though having first dissociated myself from him, I am now taking his side. Some explanation is therefore needed. Kraemer is an undeniably proficient scholar in the comparative and historical study of religions, and he has for this reason among others been invited to compose a treatise in preparation for the world-conference on Christian missionary policy which is to be held in December next in Madras. That treatise is now complete and has recently been published in English, and has been commended to the public by the Archbishop of York in a short preface in which he says that it is likely to remain for many years to come the classical treatment of its theme . . . and that it will supply the principles of missionary policy for our generation. I feel compelled to suggest however that His Grace may in this special case have written inadvisedly with his pen, since his own carefully considered attitude towards natural theology as set forth in his Gifford lectures is entirely different from that exhibited by Dr. Kraemer in his chapter on the content of the Christian Gospel, and consists of the following points :

(1) Unless all existence is a medium for Revelation, no particular Revelation is possible.

[2] I have left this paragraph as it stands, because although perhaps the remarks of Miss Ashley and Mr. Henderson on the first day of the conference might have slightly modified its form, if I had heard them before it was written, in the main I think that they support my views. I learn with satisfaction from Sir E. Phipps that much is now being planned to help the training college.

(2) Either all occurrences are in some degree revelation of God, or else there is no such revelation at all.

(3) Only if God is revealed . . . in the history of Syrians and Philistines can He be revealed in the history of Israel.

(4) Particular revelation, if detached from universal revelation, loses its root in the rational coherence of the world, and consequently becomes itself a superstition and a fruitful source of superstitions.

According to Dr. Kraemer the Church has nothing whatever to learn from natural theology, but can only learn from Scripture. There is no 'line of approach' to Christianity from non-Christian religions. Yet the Bible and all its doctrines are part of, and the product of so-called empirical Christianity. Even Hebrew prophetic realism emerges out of an ethnic background. Whatever is Absolute in Christianity must either be behind and beyond even the doctrines of the Bible, or else intertwined with the empirical throughout, as it probably is. I do not think that Kraemer fairly faces the fact that the phenomenon of a corpus of sacred books, the concepts of sin and atonement, and even the idea of an incursion of The Eternal into time, themselves belong to the world of empirical religion. It is the use made of these items by God 'in the fulness of time' which is Absolute and Final, not the items themselves. And again, Kraemer's anthropology is so ultra-Calvinistic that the Absolute in his theology is narrowed down to the simple proclamation of rescue and acquittal to a ruined race in which the *imago dei* has been destroyed. The teaching Church is on this reading of the Gospel confined in her activities to a narrow Puritanism which rejects all art, letters, and empirical science. I can hardly imagine any of my hearers wishing to teach along these lines, but I think it my duty to point out the danger with which during the next few months we shall be specially confronted. I do not want the Church of England to go to Tembaram and be compromised. Should the conference of the Christian Churches at Tembaram find itself officially committed to Dr. Kraemer's assessment of the Absolute Element in Christianity, and to his denial that there is any approach to it through non-Christian religious systems, that conference and the whole of the Christianity which it represents will have seriously imperilled their future. My disagreement with Kraemer's programme is not that he stands firmly for a Final Element in Christian truth as an inheritance, but that his

account of that Element is much too circumscribed, and much too dissociated from the remainder of human religious activities. It was natural that the extreme polymorphous relativism of the late Ernst Troeltsch, in his final phase, should have occasioned alarm, and have led scholars both at home and abroad to seek for other solutions of the problem of finality, and no doubt Kraemer's is one of the ablest and most lucid of these alternative solutions which have been put forward. But that does not necessarily make it the correct one, and if it is to be foisted upon us with authority I am sure that it is going to be an embarrassment both to the clergy and the teaching profession, and the time to speak out about it is now. We should no doubt most of us agree with Kraemer in rejecting that specific distinction between natural and supernatural which is characteristic of some Latin theology, but we shall I think feel bound to differ from him in that we regard the natural and the supernatural as intertwined and interrelated throughout the whole of religious experience. There are degrees of revelational intensity, but no point or points at which we can say 'the whole is given, and the empirical element is nil.'

How much to be preferred is the doctrine set forth by Dr. Kraemer's fellow-countryman, Prof. van der Leeuw of Groningen in his recent work, *Religion in Essence and Manifestation*, in which he maintains that no form of religious experience is even a mere tendency. On the contrary, it is not Man himself who is the active agent in the situation, but in one mode or another God; a divine activity sustains all the phenomena alike, from their most primitive types to their culmination in Christianity, as well as those religious movements that are now concealed by our largely secularized civilization.

But now, having settled our principles, what further can be said usefully from a practical standpoint about the 'ecclesia' as 'discens'? Perhaps very little that is new, but at least one thing that does not yet seem to have become current coin in our common ways of thought. Nearly all Christian teachers have still to accustom themselves to the fresh perspective provided by the astronomers, and to recognize the trifling distance (about 58 generations) which separates us from the historical Jesus. It seems hardly credible that we have yet reached ripeness in our apprehension of all that He had to bring to this

earth: indeed we may almost say that the whole of the period covered up to the present may be called (and certainly *will* be called in the future) 'early Church history.' How humble and teachable then should the Church be, how free from arrogance and self-conscious infallibility! As one reads some of the apologetic that is put forth from time to time one is painfully conscious that a great deal of it is little more than audacious bluff, backed by no real devotion to the truth, and as discreditably tendencious as that put forth by the alternative ideologies of the day. Having read it one can only murmur: 'non tali auxilio.' Some forms of Christianity, together with Nazi and Bolshevik ideologies, are obviously products of rationalization, not of straight thinking. The Church must be proved never to have made a mistake in doctrine, or the Japanese must be proved to be Nordics, or the Old Testament demonstrated to be literally inerrant; and the machinery of scholarship is set to work accordingly.

One might stop at this point: but I would add one further plea in this matter of teachableness, and that is, for a greater readiness to learn from *life*—in fact for a new realism on the part of the Church. I have now been in Holy Orders for thirty-one years. At the beginning of that period there was still on the whole a fairly widespread acceptance of the activities of the Church system as a means of forming character. To-day the unsettlement of the public mind is so great that in the County of London, out of 7,500,000 people, less than 400,000 have attachment to any place of worship; which means that nearly 95 per cent., though not by any means anti-religious or even anti-Christian in sentiment, are unattached. Under such conditions no Church can properly fulfil its teaching task, since it does not engage the attention of the public. Work like that of our association, so far from being completed, would seem to have hardly begun. I do not understand the relative complacency with which this state of affairs appears to be regarded by those in authority in the Church of England, for any serious tackling of the problem is almost impossible by the individual incumbent. The most *he* can do is to try to hold together the minority of (usually) old-fashioned people who stick to him, and even they are beginning to waver. The incumbent, unless he chooses to

break the law, is like a man fighting a giant with one hand tied behind his back, and his legs entangled in a net. It is useless to try to help him along the lines of any single party or school of thought. That, however well-meant, is simply tinkering with the situation. The causes of the drift from institutional Christianity are many and complex, and they are by no means all the fault of the Church; and it is evident that, strange to relate, the drift in France is at present all the other way. I express no opinion as to the causes or value of the revival, but I note that in the *Times Supplement* issued on the occasion of the recent Royal visit to France, it is recorded that since 1931 no less than 92 new churches have been built in the Paris area alone, and are already in use, and that the number of children in French Catholic primary schools has risen from 887,000 in 1935 to 1,169,000 in 1937, out of a total of $5\frac{1}{4}$ million school children. In one parish the number of baptisms has increased from 20 per cent. to 70 per cent. of the births, and the number of religious marriages from 15 per cent. to 60 per cent. A senior member of my university who visited central France this spring has confirmed the impression given by these figures. We can point to no similar advance in this country, taken as a whole. There is of course an obvious difference between the Christianity of the two nations concerned. That of France is strongly authoritarian. The whole tendency in England is towards laxity and indiscipline. In France the *libre penseur* is for the time being at any rate out of fashion. In England at the moment there is almost no popular standard of belief, and hardly any discipline. For my own part I am convinced that were we able to restore discipline we should be really in a better and more secure state than the French, since thanks to the work of two generations of Modernists, we have a theology available which can be commended to the educated public with greater confidence than the products of Gallican neo-scholasticism. Meanwhile, however, the drift is serious, and it is the absence of discipline which hits us at every turn. If the denominations were more united, perhaps the State could help us somewhat in this matter, though I do not for a moment wish to suggest the revival of fines for non-attendance at public worship, even were they likely to be enforceable! Further, I cannot understand why it is that the Free Church element in our

national life is not more awake to the peril of the situation which it has in the past largely created. There is a great readiness to sympathize with those churches on the continent which are resisting the claims of the totalitarian state, but no special signs of awareness that the totalitarian state is slowly developing in England — perhaps unintentionally and more in some localities than in others — through machinery originally set up by the Board of Education. I count many Free Churchmen as my good friends and colleagues, but it must be plain that past readiness to accept attenuated syllabuses of Scripture instruction and absence of tests for teachers has on the one hand produced generation after generation of young people who have the very barest acquaintance with Christianity as a working scheme of belief and practice, and has on the other hand enabled County Education departments to separate the children under their control more and more from conscious fellowship in the Christian Church, conceived in any wide or great sense. Fear of clerical predominance or of Catholic or Anglo-Catholic ascendancy has carried well-meaning people much too far in the opposite direction, and they are now wringing their hands over the spectacle of a secularized youth. He that hath an ear let him hear what the spirit saith unto the Churches, now—before it is too late.

Twenty years ago I ventured to point out from experiences as a military hospital chaplain that a Christian faith such as would build character could not be conveyed across school desks on the basis of the Cowper-Temple clause, and that the sooner we gave up trying to do it the better for the youth of this country. A few people, among them the present Bishop of Gloucester, but not many I fear, seemed to see the point of my criticism. Twenty years have gone by, and the progress made, if any, is pitifully small. This is partly due to the lag in Church reunion, partly to the success of the powers of darkness in persuading so many of us to become interested in less urgent matters. Anyhow, there is no sort of doubt that much of the time and energy expended upon so-called divinity teaching in schools is largely a waste. The real way to teach Christianity is by combining knowledge of the essential facts with practical training in prayer and in the continual practice of the Presence of God,

and still more with practical training in the application of Christianity to life. Some of us will no doubt be acquainted with the empirical methods of Canon Tyndale Biscoe in his boys' school at Srinagar, Kashmir. The essence of these is to link belief with practice, and to show how the Christian differs from the non-Christian in his approach to the tasks and problems of daily life. It may be easier in India than in England to illustrate this by striking contrasts. But I am convinced that the methods are just as much needed here at home. I have myself gained much more satisfactory results than I ever got from any Sunday school in a scouts' camp of limited size, where carefully conducted daily prayers and worship and instructional talks could be combined with character-building games and camp-work, and the small numbers enabled boys to be watched and guided, and a written record of their characters kept and shared afterwards with their parents. It is much to be wished that intensive work of this kind could be multiplied and increased in size and quality, and that clergy and school-teachers could co-operate more in its extension. But I must not expand these themes any further. Once again I would plead for a new realism, for the Church to face facts, cut her losses, utilize much more adequately the unique resources which she undoubtedly possesses, and show at least as much enterprise about capturing youth for the ways of truth and eternal life as is shown by those whose ideologies, pressed to their logical conclusions, can only end in division and destruction.

Mr. H. G. Wells recently asked teachers (at the meeting of the British Association) the searching question (which no doubt has been frequently in the minds if not on the lips of those attending this Conference): 'Are you helping to make a new world, or are you trying to pickle the world as it stands?' Christian teachers must needs treat this as involving them in a false antithesis. On the one hand they must for ever be seeking to make a new world, since Christians are born not of the flesh but of the Spirit; and in each succeeding generation, human society, with all its new institutions and inventions, except it be born anew, cannot become the Kingdom of God, but will remain what it is, a jungle of land-animals which bite and devour one another! On the other hand, teachers must decline to abandon

that Timeless Element in the (admittedly) spatio-temporal Gospel, which, so far from being a mere chemical preservative of the dead past, is a perpetual and living Dynamic, once fitly compared to leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened.

To change the metaphor, take out of the world of to-day the Christian doctrine and faith touching the nature and purpose of Deity, and the living forces of Christian social service, and what remains? The world without these would be like a watch with its main spring broken.

NOTE BY AUTHOR.

[It appears that the reference to the need of discipline in my paper is felt to demand elucidation. I do not mean, in the main, 'ecclesiastical discipline' such as would inhibit progress and experiment. What I had in mind was the lamentable and shocking lack of self-discipline shown by many in our nation to-day, and evident in slovenliness of technique, in unwillingness to stick to a job after its novelty had worn off, or when it had become difficult or irksome, in failure to keep appointments or contracts, to answer letters, and to guard against sloppy self-indulgence. In the specifically 'Church' sphere this shows itself in a generally diffused and vague Christian sentimentalism which does not go much further than being spasmodically kind when it suits one to be so, and which shirks any sustained effort involving regularity as distinct from impulse. There is reluctance to accept the Christian belief and practice as involving what Dr. Inge has called 'a creed for heroes.' The discipline of self-denial, or of regular participation in public or private devotions at agreed and stated times and intervals (rather than when the mood takes us) is unpopular, and the effects are obvious all round us. I would myself welcome a good deal of liberty to experiment granted by Church and State working together, in the ordering of public worship within the limits well-recognised as those of the Anglican Church, both in the Catholic and Protestant directions. But I would also like to see Church and State working together to encourage the conviction that sound character (displayed in a noble and living creed and in unwearied service of others) can only be built up by painstaking self-imposition of discipline, and to discourage all who hold to the contrary path. The consistent adherence to faith in the Christian belief as to Deity, and the consistent practice of loving kindness are not the easy things they seem. They are simple but hard. In addition to the now hackneyed slogan: 'Keep fit for England' I would suggest another: 'Keep self-disciplined for England.']

AUTHORITY AND FREEDOM IN MODERN CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

By J. S. Boys Smith, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

THE questions I propose to consider under this title are not primarily questions of method. I shall not enquire on what occasions in Christian teaching it is wise to make explicit appeal to authority, or when it is more important to emphasize the value of freedom. In the first place, the fundamental problems of education are problems of aim, not of method; and nowhere is it more important to remember this than in Christian education. What is it that in Christian education we are trying to achieve? In the second place, if we are to know the rightful place of authority and of freedom, we must learn first what they are and how they are related. In what sense does the Christian rely upon authority in his belief and in his conduct? And what is Christian freedom? I propose, therefore, to attempt some consideration of these fundamental questions. If Christians shared a common mind on these questions, problems of practical method would not divide them.

Most of those who are concerned at all with Christian education have grown up more or less consciously as heirs of the Christian tradition, and thus approach the problems of religion as Christian believers. Yet they are aware that, if they are to inherit this tradition, and at the same time to maintain it intelligently and to commend it to others, they have to-day to meet a large number of problems. To enter deeply into these problems is not the concern of everyone equally; but it is the task of everyone who takes his membership of the Christian society seriously to be as far as he may at once a sincere Christian believer and an educated member of the modern world. For reasons which we need not now try to analyse, the problems which the Christian believer has to meet in his thought and in his conduct are to-day more difficult than usual. Consequently, the question—always difficult—how to relate rightly the attitude of religious faith and the attitude of enquiry is especially acute; and, from the religious side, there is a natural tendency to look

for some authority that is beyond the range of doubt and criticism.

That it is difficult to combine the critical, enquiring attitude with full religious faith is unquestionably true. But to hold that they are incompatible, in the sense that faith must entail the laying aside of enquiry, would, I am sure, be a most serious misunderstanding. I might maintain this from the side of enquiry, by shewing that real enquiry, which is essentially an open-minded and unprejudiced attitude, very different from that criticism which is more concerned to find error than to find truth, itself involves a kind of faith—faith in the worth and the attainability of truth; and I think this would be recognized by those who have learned how enquiry, though controlled and scientific, may be as compelling and as self-forgetful as a passion. But I wish rather to maintain the kinship from the other side, and to shew that real religious faith, far from being a dogmatic attitude, itself involves that very openness to evidence and that lack of prejudice which are so important in enquiry. To see this will provide our best introduction to the problem of authority; for our question will then become, What is the nature and place of authority in an open-minded and enquiring faith, such as religion itself demands? And we may then find that Christian freedom is attained only as we learn to obey the demands of what alone has ultimate authority.

In saying that faith is an open-minded, enquiring attitude, I do not mean that it is an attitude of suspense of judgment or complete detachment. At its best, it is an attitude of full assurance, in which doubt is overcome. To the Christian believer the objections of the hostile critic may often seem ill-informed and irrelevant, because they appear to leave untouched the real ground upon which his faith rests; and I think he may then be fully justified in his refusal—which may be a passionate refusal —to surrender his faith, even though he be unable to refute the sceptical objection or to analyse clearly the ground on which his own faith is based. But he could not be justified if his faith were a blind dogmatism, or if his refusal were the result of cowardice or of unwillingness to regard the evidence. He is justified only if his faith does rest upon evidence, evidence which the hostile critic has overlooked, and is perhaps unable to understand. In temper, religious faith is not dogmatic, though it may be full

of assurance; it is never arrogant, but always humble, with that humility which we call humility before the facts; and it is certainly never cowardly, but can inspire a courage which neither human threats nor lower incentives can wholly overcome.

What, then, is this attitude of faith? To give a full answer, in the sense of pointing out the evidence it rests upon and of shewing how it is possible, is, I believe, one of the most difficult, though one of the most important, tasks which a philosophy of religion can undertake. My purpose here is more limited. I desire to emphasize that faith is not an attitude which it is our duty somehow to conjure up in ourselves and to guard against assaults; it is belief and trust in something which has wholly convinced us — convinced us both of its reality and of its supreme worth. Where faith is truly religious, we do not try to constrain or force ourselves to believe; it is the object which constrains us. Only when the object constrains us, and we have no need to constrain belief, is faith real. We have no right to try to believe anything unless it impresses us as true. To try to persuade ourselves into believing what we do not really think to be true is the very contrary of the religious attitude, for which the reality and real worth of its object—of what we trust in and worship as God—is absolutely essential. 'A true faith is simply faith in the truth solely because it convinces us that it is true.'[1]

There are, of course, all manner of difficulties here. In what sense can we apprehend God? What is the nature of the evidence upon which faith rests? Is not faith very different, after all, from belief in any argument, something perhaps at once less and yet more than a rational conclusion? These are real questions, and I am well aware that what I have said has not provided an answer to them. Moreover, if we were to ask *what* we believe, *what* convinces us, then, if we are Christian believers, we should have to try to express to ourselves all that God means to us and all the grounds — which may be numerous and complex—on which we are assured of him; and that would involve the attempt to describe a great range of experience, indeed in the end a great part of what the world, its processes, the laws and the standards governing it, seem to us to be. That I am not attempting here; I am seeking to emphasize the one point I

[1] John Oman, *Grace and Personality*, 3rd ed., 1925, p. 136; *cf.* L. A. Reid, *Creative Morality*, 1936, pp. 210-19.

have tried to express. But if this central contention is correct, it must surely be true that faith is an undogmatic, open-minded, enquiring attitude. To express it in a word, faith is an attitude of complete sincerity in the face of our whole environment.

This real sincerity is a rare and difficult thing, though, when we meet with it, it is one of the most attractive and beautiful of all qualities of character. Indeed, we may truly call it the root of all virtue, of moral and of intellectual virtue alike. Apart from it, there is no good thinking, no right acting, no first-class work of any kind. We recognize it very quickly, *e.g.* in the honest and careful scholar, in the good craftsman, and in the good man. Though to acquire it fully is the hardest of all tasks, it is yet a quality which is within the reach of everyone, learned or simple. This is one reason why true religion is no privilege of learning or position, and why even in a mind of great and complex attainment it remains to the end something simple.

If real sincerity is hard to acquire, real faith must also be hard to acquire; for sincerity is its necessary condition. To have the open mind, not merely to this sort of evidence or that sort of evidence, but to the full witness of our whole environment, is a thing not easily gained nor easily preserved. There has, of course, been much emphasis through Christian history upon the sinfulness of doubt and of wrong belief. But there is, I think, ultimately only one sense in which unbelief is sin—a sense, however, which is very important. It is sinful, not because we have failed to persuade ourselves to believe or to suppress doubt and enquiry, but only when our lack of belief is due to lack of sincerity in receiving the evidence of the truth itself; that is, when we are insincere with God's witness to himself. Even in purely theoretical enquiries the worst errors are due, not to inevitable stupidity or lack of native capacity, but to moral failures—to such causes as indolence or indifference to truth, unreadiness to regard fairly the evidence which counts against what we desire, or the wish to refute an opponent or to shew ourselves to be right. These are all examples of the lack of that sincerity of which I have spoken; they are ways in which we may be indifferent to evidence, or may seek to manipulate it for our personal advantage. Religious faith, more than other knowledge or belief, demands this inward sincerity; it is bound up, with a peculiar degree of intimacy, with a moral sincerity; and in *this*

sense unbelief 'may be a clearer manifestation of deep moral corruption than the shadiest action.'[2] Yet we cannot create or maintain a true faith by suppressing doubt, or criticism, or contrary opinion; this is also a manipulation of truth, and the same evil. 'In the strict sense, we should not even try to believe; for we have no right to believe anything we can avoid believing, granting we have given it entire freedom to convince us. Strictly speaking also, we have no right to exhort people to believe, and much of that very common type of exhortation is mere distrust of truth and disregard of veracity. . . . There is only one right way of asking men to believe, which it to put before them what they ought to believe because it is true; and there is only one right way of persuading, which is to present what is true in such a way that nothing will prevent it from being seen except the desire to abide in darkness; and there is only one further way of helping them, which is to point out what they are cherishing that is opposed to faith. When all this has been done, it is still necessary to recognize that faith is God's gift, not our handiwork; of His manifestation of the truth by life, not of our demonstration by argument or of our impressing by eloquence; and that even He is willing to fail till He can have the only success love could value — personal acceptance of the truth simply because it is seen to be true.'[3]

I have considered the attitude of faith and its relation to enquiry at length, because if the nature of faith is misconceived it is impossible to understand the function of authority in religion. It might perhaps seem as though personal acceptance of the truth simply because it is seen to be true were the antithesis of belief on authority, and consequently that authority could have no place in religion. That would be a misunderstanding. It is true that, if the word 'authority' is used to mean an influence or power exerted to suppress or to supersede personal insight, authority in that sense has no rightful place in religion, or indeed anywhere else. But authority, in the proper sense, is never merely power, nor indeed essentially power at all. To possess authority is not to possess the power to enforce obedience, but to possess the character which imposes obligation. The characters which impose obligation are truth and worth. These alone,

[2] John Oman, *op. cit.*, p. 141; *cf.* R. G. Collingwood, *The Principles of Art*, 1938, especially pp. 217-21, 282-85. [3] John Oman, *op. cit.*, pp. 142-43.

therefore, are ultimately authoritative. Moreover, what has truth or worth actually exercises authority only in so far as its authoritative character is seen and recognized as such. Thus the truly authoritative rules always by the appeal it makes to personal insight and the obligation it imposes upon personal acceptance. Consequently, personal acceptance of truth or worth simply because it is seen to be such is the only real obedience to authority. There is much else which may successfully extort submission, much which prudence may counsel us to observe; but this, if it is no more, has no real authority, such that the human spirit, whilst true to itself, must unconditionally obey it. Moreover, the appeal to insight, through which authority exercises its rule, is necessarily an appeal to the responsible person. Thus the sphere of authority is the sphere of personal responsibility.

I have now stated what I believe to be the main principle of authority. It applies universally; in matters of thought and in matters of conduct, in the sphere of religion and in the sphere of politics. But I will add two further explanations. I offer them, however, expressly as explanations, not as limitations, of the principle I have stated.

(1) First, I have contended that nothing exercises real authority, as distinct from power or influence, unless it appeals by its intrinsic worth or truth to personal insight, which means the insight of the individual mind. This will be misunderstood if it is interpreted too narrowly. The appeal is not to mere sentiment, in contrast to knowledge and experience; nor to the mere power of argument, in contrast to the whole range and depth of experience; and it is not an appeal to the individual in a sense which excludes what comes to be his in consequence of his membership of a society—a church, a nation, a particular group —or of his inheritance of a tradition. My contention is not open to the charge of sentimentalism, narrow intellectualism, or false individualism. That an authority makes its appeal in any of these limited ways is a sign merely that it possesses a limited authority.

(2) Secondly, we must distinguish between the primary authority of what imposes obligation, *viz.* truth or worth, and the secondary authority of what mediates it to us or affords us the means of recognizing it. Our own unaided insight is inevitably incomplete, and both in our thought and in our conduct we are

partly dependent upon the assistance of others. Thus we accept expert opinion and respect qualified advice, and these rightly carry authority. But they carry authority, *i.e.* impose obligation as distinct from merely exerting influence, only because the persons who offer them possess a knowledge or appreciation greater than our own, and are thereby well qualified; and only because we have reason to believe that they are well qualified are we able to recognize the authority of what they say. The primary authority resides in the truth or the worth of what they tell us; they themselves are secondary authorities, in that they mediate it to us, and enable us in some degree to see it ourselves. The extent of our dependence upon authority in this sense is obviously very great. It includes not merely our dependence upon particular persons, but our dependence upon society as a whole, its laws and standards and customs, and upon the experience and wisdom preserved in a long tradition.

Most of the practical problems that concern authority arise in regard to authority in this secondary sense, especially in regard to the degree of obligation it imposes on us and to the manner in which it should be exercised over others. These are questions of practical conduct. We cannot decide them by applying any formal rule, but only by learning to appreciate and to estimate rightly the various elements in each concrete situation as it arises. But we may notice two important principles, one in regard to our dependence upon authority, the other in regard to our exercise of it.

Dependence upon authority, and obligation to obey it, never replace our own responsibility. The function of authority is not to supersede personal judgment, but to supply the evidence which will determine it rightly. In accepting anything as authoritative, as distinct from merely yielding to its influence or submitting to its power, we are judging it to be right, and in this judgment we are responsible. Moreover, each act of obedience must at the same time be a personal decision. If we decide to accept an authority once and for all and thereafter follow it blindly, our obedience is no longer real obedience to real authority; for what we thus submit to ceases for us to have the character of authority. Authority is accepted as such only so long as it is accepted by a free and responsible decision.

The exercise of authority must observe a like condition. Its

ultimate aim must be to enlighten personal insight and to strengthen independent judgment. If it endeavours to supersede or to suppress personal responsibility, it abuses its position; and in so far as it succeeds, it ceases to be the exercise of authority, and becomes mere power, influence, or tyranny. The exercise of authority ceases where personal responsibility is suppressed or superseded.

The ultimate aim in the exercise of authority is also the ultimate aim in true education. I believe that the enlightenment of personal insight and the strengthening of independent judgment should be the aim of all teaching, whether that of a school or that of a church; indeed that it should be the aim of every society, civil or religious. But if we adopt it as an aim, it is of great importance that we should employ a method that is consistent with it. In the world to-day we see around us, most obviously in the political sphere, but also in other spheres, an entirely incompatible method, *viz.* that of systematic controlled propaganda. This does not aim at strengthening independent judgment; it aims at exactly the reverse. It is the method of so selecting and controlling the evidence that comes before the mind and of securing its constant reiteration that a prescribed opinion is imposed irresistibly upon vast numbers, who remain hardly conscious of the influence. By this method some useful results can be achieved, and also some of the most terrible; but the one thing that, by the very nature of the method, can never be achieved is the thing that alone has ultimate worth — the acquirement of the qualities of personal responsibility and insight, which are the condition of all spiritual attainment.

What I have said of authority, whether in its primary or in its secondary sense, holds true without exception. It applies to all ecclesiastical decisions and to the rules and tradition of the Christian Church; it applies to the Christian Scriptures, as a whole and in all their parts; it applies to the person and to the sayings of Jesus Christ; and it applies to all God's revelation of himself. Authority resides in what by its own nature imposes obligation; and it is exercised only as it is recognized by personal, responsible insight. 'The divine seer does not convey over to you *his* revelation, but qualifies you to receive your own.'[4] And

[4] James Martineau, *The Seat of Authority in Religion*, 2nd ed., 1890, p. 308.

we may add that he and you alike can receive it only by sincere and responsible recognition. In instructing others, our primary task is to encourage and to equip them to use their personal recognition in sincerity and humility and without fear or partiality.

I have spoken mainly of authority; but I have, I hope, at the same time revealed something of the meaning of the freedom of a Christian man. I wish in conclusion to enlarge upon this in one respect. I do not set freedom and recognition of authority in antithesis to each other; for man they can never be so set, when each is rightly understood. We may say that the dignity of man consists in his responsibility, in his knowledge of good and evil, of truth and falsehood, and his responsibility for decision. It consists in this responsibility, rather than in his actual achievement, because this is the condition of all spiritual achievement, and because, though he may neglect or abuse it, while he remains human he cannot renounce it. On this account, whether he be virtuous or sinful, he must continue to claim and to deserve our respect; just as we believe that he stands always under the love and the mercy of God. But man is not the author and creator of his own standards. His task is to learn, by slow degrees, to know them; and his destiny is to find his freedom in their free recognition. Thus his destiny is not to escape from authority, or to pass beyond its sphere; as a creature, he remains within it. But, as a human creature, God's child and not his mere handiwork, he may learn to dwell in it as a world which demands and receives his reverence. That it is possible for man, as a responsible creature, to find in the knowledge and acceptance of the truth his own full freedom rests upon a great presupposition : that the standards he learns to know as demanding and as freely receiving his unconditional reverence are also the ultimate standards of the world and derive from the nature of God its Creator. The belief that this, or something like it, is true lies, I believe, at the heart of all really religious faith. The Christian faith claims our wholehearted devotion as, yet only as, we are persuaded in full sincerity, and in the light of all our evidence, that this is ultimately true, and that in the Christian faith it is at once expressed most fully and received most unreservedly.